DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 451 883 JC 010 330

TITLE	The Florida Community College System: A Strategic Plan for the Millennium, 1998-2003.
INSTITUTION	Florida State Board of Community Colleges, Tallahassee.
PUB DATE	1999-01-00
NOTE	95p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Planning; *Community Colleges; Enrollment; *Environmental Scanning; Futures (of Society); Institutional Characteristics; Mission Statements; *Strategic Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida

ABSTRACT

This report describes the 1998-2003 strategic plan of the Florida Community College System (FCCS). The plan's goals include: (1) enrolling 45% of high school graduates in community colleges by expanding partnerships with K-12 schools and improving child-care and transportation alternatives; (2) meeting the challenge of the Florida Chamber of Commerce to supply business and industry with well-educated and trained employees by aligning new program startups with identified business sector needs; (3) making credentialed learning more accessible by applying various modes of instructional delivery in collaboration with university and public school partners; (4) making colleges technologically competitive in support of instructional goals by spurring economic development partnerships around technological advancement; and (5) establishing predictable state budgeting for stability in college planning by developing a comprehensive cost-to-continue budget formula that will promote increased productivity and competitive faculty and staff salaries. Other highlights include: (1) in the past four years, FCCS has assimilated eight major funding and program changes; (2) FCCS degree and certificate productivity is up 22% since 1994; and (3) in 1997-98, the college awarded 37,707 associate degrees and 11,547 certificates. Appended are authorizing statutes, Postsecondary Education Planning Commission goals and recommendations, an academic ethics statement, the design team report; the State Board of Community Colleges strategic plan task force member list, objectives, and acronyms and abbreviations. (Contains 22 references.) (JA)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 451 883

The Florida Community College System:

A Strategic Plan for the Millennium 1998-2003

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Maxwell
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

TC010330

Florida State Board of Community Colleges

January, 1999

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1998
Members, State Board of Community Colleges

Chairman
C. Ronald Belton
Jacksonville, Florida

Vice Chairman
Randall W. Hanna
Tallahassee, Florida

Richard W. D'Alemberte
Chattahoochee, FL

John M. Belohlavek
Tampa, FL

Frank T. Brogan
Commissioner of Education

Patrick E. Byrne II
Niceville, FL

Margarita R. Delagado
Miami, FL

Joseph H. Lang
St. Petersburg, FL

George I. Platt III
Fort Lauderdale, FL

Marjorie Starnes
Fort Myers, FL

Wendell W. Williams
Avon Park, FL

Alberta Wilson
Rockledge, FL

Matthew F. Yarber
Port Richey, FL

Executive Director
J. David Armstrong, Jr.
Community College System

Purpose

The purpose of the State Board of Community Colleges Strategic Plan for 1998-2003 is to provide a framework for informed decision making for the twenty-eight institutions in the Florida Community College System (CCS) and to provide information to the public and Legislature.

Produced by the Division of Community Colleges
325 West Gaines Street, Suite 1314, Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400
For additional information, contact: Dr. Thomas E. Furlong, Jr. or Dr. Patricia Windham

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The State Board of Community Colleges wishes to acknowledge the invaluable contributions of information and analysis provided by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, the State University System, the Florida Department of Education, representatives from the independent colleges and universities in Florida, and various individuals at all twenty-eight community colleges in the State. Special appreciation is due to the members of the Strategic Plan Task Force, without whom this document would not exist.

A Strategic Plan for the Millennium
Table of Contents

Acknowledgments i
A Message from the Executive Director v
Introduction 1

Vision 3
Mission Statement 4
Planning Process 5
Underlying Principles 6
Planning Context 10

Millennium Challenges 22

Adequacy Challenge 22
Access Challenge 26
Technology Challenge 44
Performance Challenge 49
Workforce Challenge 51
Partnership Challenge 57
Conclusion 58
References 59
Appendices 61
A-Authorizing Statutes 62
B-Postsecondary Education Planning Commission Goals and Recommendations 67
C-Academic Ethics Statement 76
D-Design Team Report 79
E-SBCC Strategic Plan Task Force Members 99
F-Objectives 100
G-Acronyms and Abbreviations 104
Index 106

A MESSAGE FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

What an exciting time to plan! The end of a century and of a millennium gives us plenty from which to learn, while envisioning the limitless opportunities of a new age. The imprudence of poor planning, or of failing to plan, can be conquered more easily than the common habit of planning well and leaving the blueprint on the shelf. The State Board of Community Colleges pledges to make this plan a living document, one by which we will test ourselves in progress reports well into the next millennium.

Partners in Planning. In approaching this Strategic Plan, the State Board and the individual colleges chose (1) to continue relevant themes from the 1993 Master Plan, (2) to embrace many of the assumptions and recommendations of the recent Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (PEPC) master plan, (3) to review the statements of principle and vision recorded by the Florida Association of Community Colleges, (4) to apply effective strategies that have been proven by local colleges in Florida and elsewhere and (5) to respond to priorities declared by the Florida business community. As a result, this document balances the interests of the marketplace and the ivory tower, the needs of 28 great communities and of the entire state, the aspirations of hundreds of thousands of students and the means for them to follow their dreams.

People and Their Work. A Global Economy, the Information Age and the Third Millennium converge to present us with opportunities like few others since the dawn of time. Some of the trends are indeed daunting. State business leaders cite a shortage of skilled workers. The national Council on Competitiveness has singled out "worker skills as the greatest competitive challenge facing the nation over the next decade." Enterprise Florida reports workforce skills as one of the top three factors in business decisions to locate or expand here. Florida is 47th in America in the percentage of students proceeding to College upon high school graduation. Only 29% of the 19-year-olds in Florida today will enroll in higher education. An entire generation of skilled workers will retire by 2005. Sixty per cent of all jobs require technical competence in the use of information technology. In the 21st Century, it is estimated that our grandchildren will change entire careers between five and seven times, and change jobs approximately 11 times! By contrast, our parents were disinclined to change jobs at all.

The Technology Dilemma. The advent of distance learning methods enhances the prospects of instruction being delivered anytime, any place, and at any pace. But Florida has no designated funding source for technology in our community colleges.

To move us forward, the Strategic Plan targets policies that engender economic growth. This summary does not do justice to the scope of the Plan nor to the efforts required to implement it. However, we can identify key areas of emphasis:

- **Increased access by high school graduates to community college education.** Goal: Enroll 45% of high school graduates in community colleges. How? By expanding partnerships with K-12 to assure tomorrow's high school graduates are "college ready" and by improving child-care and transportation alternatives in support of our diverse mix of students.

- **Market-driven workforce education programs.** Goal: Meet the challenge of the Florida Chamber of Commerce to supply business and industry with "well-educated and trained employees." How? Align new program startups with identified business sector needs, establish industry-recognized credentials in workforce training, and create welfare-to-work transition programs, among others.
- **Expanded partnerships with public schools, state universities, private colleges and universities and with business.** Goal: Make credentialed learning more accessible. How? Apply various modes of instructional delivery in collaboration with university and public school partners.
- **Investment in the technology infrastructure of colleges.** Goal: Make colleges technologically competitive in support of instructional goals. How? Spur economic development partnerships around technological advancement.
- **Consistency in budgeting.** Goal: Establish predictable state budgeting for stability in college planning. How? Develop a comprehensive cost-to-continue budget formula that will promote increased productivity, timely startup of new programs, and competitive faculty and staff salaries.

There's much more, of course. Please read this creative work product of State Board members themselves, members of the Strategic Plan Task Force and of staff from the Division of Community Colleges. I want to thank, in particular, Mr. Joseph H. Lang, chairman of the Strategic Plan Task Force of the State Board, Dr. Tom Furlong, Mr. Ed Cisek, Dr. Lanny Larson, and Dr. Patricia Windham and staff of the Division of Community Colleges for their good work. We are well within the mark to say that if the resources are provided, these goals can be met. The Florida Community College System has a proud history of being able to deliver on its promises. Eight times in the past four years, it has assimilated major funding and program changes. Its degree and certificate productivity is up 22% since 1994. In 1997-98, the colleges awarded 37,707 associate degrees and 11,547 certificates.

The governance that led such success reflects a careful balance of autonomy (the "home rule" of District Boards of Trustees) and the coordination of the State Board of Community Colleges. In conclusion, let me defer to others for timely remarks that will transcend the turn of the millenium:

First, Jim Adams, Chairman of Texas Instruments: "The community college system is an absolutely imperative part of the fabric of education in this country. It's the thing that will help us be competitive leaders in the world . . ."

Second, Tom Peters, management guru and author: "Support your community colleges ... the unsung, under-funded backbone of America's all-important lifelong learning network."

J. David Armstrong, Jr.
Executive Director
Florida Community College System

INTRODUCTION

Florida's Community College System began in 1933 when Palm Beach Junior College was established as a public two-year college. From that date until 1947, when the status of St. Petersburg Junior College was changed from private to public, Palm Beach Junior College remained the only public two-year college in Florida. When the Florida Minimum Foundation Program was enacted in 1947, combined state and local support for community colleges became a reality. Because of this combined support, Pensacola Junior College was established in 1947. Also, Chipola Junior College, established in 1947 as a private institution, changed its status to become a public junior college.

The Legislature in 1955 established the Community College Council, whose report was published in 1957 under the title, "The Community Junior College in Florida's Future." This report, which was approved by the State Board of Education, contained recommendations for needed legal changes and a master plan for establishing a system of public community colleges in Florida. The system would provide post-high school education within commuting distance of more than 99 percent of Florida's population. With the development and implementation of the master plan, Florida became a national model for the development of a statewide system of community colleges. In 1972, the master plan was fully implemented with the opening of Pasco-Hernando Community College.

Florida's twenty-eight community colleges were established to serve the citizens of the State of Florida by offering the first two years of a baccalaureate degree, vocational education, and adult continuing education. Furthermore, in order to bring instruction closer to students, more than 2,000 other locations, including additional campuses, centers and off-campus sites such as churches, public schools, and community centers are also used.

To further ensure the efficient and effective operation of Florida's Community College System, the Florida Legislature, in 1979, established the State Community College Coordinating Board and in 1983 replaced that board with the State Board of Community Colleges (SBCC). Since then, the SBCC has earned the respect of the community colleges by strongly preserving local control, represented by local Boards of Trustees, while simultaneously establishing system-wide policies and coordination. The Florida Community College System has received national recognition because of this unusual balance between local control and state coordination and funding.

During the expansion and modification of Florida's Community College System, the postsecondary educational needs in Florida were changing. These identifiable changes included an increase in the mean age of students; changes in enrollment patterns, population growth, and population patterns; increased emphasis on vocational education/economic development; and entry of women into the work force in unprecedented numbers. The Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (PEPC) was established in 1981 to provide overall guidance and direction for the improvement of postsecondary education in Florida. A new community college master plan, the Master Plan for the Florida Community College System, was first published in September 1983. This Master Plan addressed several concerns, including emphasis on the improvement of quality, the trend toward increased part-time enrollments, minority needs, women's needs and student financial aid needs. The

1988 Master Plan updated the 1983 plan and identified challenges (from which strategic plans would evolve) addressing areas such as quality education, economic development and quality of life.

The 1993 Master Plan for the Florida Community Colleges was a call to a continued commitment to the "Challenge of a Changing Context." This master plan outlined the following eight goals for the system:

1. Preserve open access and increase student success in community college programs.

2. Strengthen the quality of programs and curricula among the community colleges.

3. Strengthen articulation, cooperation and collaboration among public schools, community colleges, the State University System, private colleges and other institutions.

4. Establish partnerships at the state and local level to support broad-based, multilateral economic development initiatives and strategies.

5. Strengthen the human resources of the community colleges.

6. Strengthen the utilization of technology to support contemporary standards and future applications in academic computing technologies, administrative computing systems, and educational telecommunications.

7. Renew Florida's commitment to community college education by strengthening the long-term fiscal stability of the system and providing support for an increasingly diverse population.

8. Strengthen and provide leadership in institutional effectiveness, accountability and local control.

These eight goals described in the 1993 Master Plan were ambitious but represented the challenges the Florida Community College System would be facing as it prepared for the year 2000.

The State Board of Community Colleges has been developing The Florida Community College System: A Strategic Plan for the Millennium (1998-2003) over the past twenty-four months. This third update to the Master/Strategic Plan has evolved out of the initial work performed by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission in producing Challenges and Choices: The Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education. Both the SBCC and the Board of Regents of the State University System are directed by statute to produce sector strategic plans. The initial phase of this effort involved joint public hearings around the state by the three groups. The SBCC then appointed a Task Force, chaired by Board Member Joe Lang, to continue seeking the Community College System's (CCS) suggestions about what the millennium plan should address. The Plan draws on and

expands upon the descriptive information produced by PEPC related to the state's demographic, social and economic patterns. The SBCC also had the advantage of information that became available after the completion of the PEPC document, e.g., 1998-99 enrollment patterns in the public schools. This process was undertaken by board members well aware of the proud history of the Florida Community College System.

Vision

The vision statement found in the 1998 PEPC Challenges and Choices document provides the context for the Community College System vision statement. It provides that:

> Postsecondary Education must provide an environment in which individuals are able to develop their capabilities to the fullest -- as life-long learners, workers, citizens, and members of families and other social institutions. More specifically, a postsecondary education system must provide Floridians with the ability to acquire an increased cultural, historic, and scientific knowledge base; technical skills appropriate to both current and emerging employment opportunities; and an understanding and appreciation of the multicultural nature of society in our increasingly interdependent world. In providing these services, postsecondary institutions must be responsive to Florida's rapidly changing social and economic needs, including taking actions to optimize the use of the resources that will be available to support those institutions in the future.

The Community College System vision embraces the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission statement and expands on those elements related to the community college sector.

The successful workforce of the emerging global information economy will require new forms of preparation and credentials. Accordingly, as the knowledge base for professional jobs in technical disciplines becomes increasingly sophisticated and competitive, there is increasing employer demand for performance-ready graduates. Required is a new practitioner-oriented curriculum that emphasizes the competencies demanded in a contemporary business environment.

The essential mission of community colleges has always been to respond to local educational and economic development needs. Employers want candidates who can demonstrate success in dealing with contemporary business problems and who can be productive, contributing members of their organization from the start. Accordingly, they seek more balance between the hard technical skills relevant to their business and essential Asoft skills@ - such as critical thinking, problem-solving communication and effective interpersonal relations - than is found in many traditional programs.

A recent study by AT&T cited employers= calls for persons capable of critical thinking, especially for persons in middle and senior management positions. This is a basic skill associated with the traditional liberal arts curriculum that is the foundation for the general education component of the AA degree. The importance of this skill is also reflected in the 15-18 hours of general education

required for the AS degree. As we move toward a more technical orientation in our workforce training, the CCS remains committed to the inherent value of the general education component of both the AS and the AA degrees and the basis it provides for a successful AA/BA and AS/BA/BS articulation process.

Mission Statement

The Mission Statement for the Florida Community College System was approved by the State Board of Community Colleges in June, 1998. It is reaffirmed as part of the Millennium Strategic Plan and reads as follows:

1. Providing lower level undergraduate instruction and awarding associate degrees;

2. Preparing students directly for vocations requiring less than baccalaureate degrees; This may include preparing for job entry, supplementing of skills and knowledge, and responding to needs in new areas of technology. Vocational education in the community college shall consist of programs leading to certificates, credit courses leading to an associate in science degree and other programs in fields requiring substantial academic work, background, or qualifications;

3. Providing the appropriate range of student development services, including assessment, student tracking, support for disabled students, advisement, counseling, financial aid, career development, and remediation and tutorial services to ensure student success; and,

4. Promoting economic development for the state within each community college district through the provision of special programs, including, but not limited to;

    a. Enterprise Florida related partnerships.
    b. Technology transfer centers.
    c. Economic development centers.
    d. Workforce literacy programs.

A separate and secondary role for community colleges includes the offering of programs in:

1. Community educational services which are not directly related to academic or occupational advancement;

2. Adult pre-college education; and,

3. Recreational and leisure services.

Planning Process

In preparation for the development of the 1998 Master Plan, the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission identified a group of key leaders representative of the beneficiaries of postsecondary education. To obtain a broad perspective, emphasis was placed on persons outside of the postsecondary education community. Among the entities represented were government, business and industry, health care, social work, and education. As the plan developed, opportunities were provided through public hearings and other means for input from individuals in all educational sectors as well as other interested persons.

The individuals contacted by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission in the Spring of 1997 were asked to comment on the following issues:

1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of our current system of postsecondary education?

2. What changes are required?

3. How can the system make greater contributions to the citizens of our state?

4. What issues, educational or otherwise, have paramount importance as Florida moves toward the next century?

Following this initial step, issue papers were prepared by staff for Postsecondary Education Planning Commission review and discussion. Three major areas--Access, Outcomes, and Funding--were selected initially as the focus of the Plan. A series of joint hearings were held in cooperation with the sectors in May, June and July at which testimony related to the major issues identified was received and discussed by members of the Commission, the Board of Regents, the State Board of Community Colleges, and the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida. During these discussions, a fourth area, Interdependence--A Seamless System, was identified as a priority as well.

In addition to working with PEPC at their joint meetings, the CCS appointed a Task Force comprised of four Community College Board Members, three community college presidents, three community college vice presidents and one provost of a community college campus. This group held seven Task Force meetings at various locations throughout the State and at each of the meetings time was reserved for public testimony. During those Task Force meetings there were twenty-two presentations from various persons representing different aspects of education affecting the strategic planning for the CCS. The organizations represented were: Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (PEPC), Board of Regents (BOR), Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP), Florida Association of Community Colleges (FACC), Florida Public Postsecondary Distance Learning Institute (FPPDLI), University of South Florida (USF), and all offices of the Division of Community Colleges (DCC).

Underlying Principles

The SBCC endorses the principles for all of postsecondary education contained in the overall Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education. The language requires that Florida's postsecondary education sectors and institutions shall:

- $ be student/customer focused;
- $ meet rising student demand while increasing program and degree completion and maintaining standards of excellence;
- $ be cost effective;
- $ use fully all providers and modes of delivery;
- $ require a fair investment by all beneficiaries--students, the state and local community, business and industry; and,
- $ reward excellence in operation and results.

In addition, the SBCC believes the CCS:

- $ will remain the major access point for postsecondary education;
- $ is the leading provider of workforce development;
- $ should be held fully accountable for its use of state funds; and,
- $ is best governed by local boards of trustees and coordinated by a State Board.

The Strategic Plan Task Force found widespread support for the current governance model based upon local boards of trustees and a state coordinating board. This allows the CCS to respond quickly to local needs within the guidelines of state policies. A recent Education Commission of the States' report supported this type of structure for states. Florida is fortunate to have already incorporated the various aspects of a good governance model into our system.

2+2 Structure

Since its inception, Florida's postsecondary system, more than any other system in the country, has relied on the community colleges and the 2+2 system. Florida ranks 5th in the country in the production of AA degrees and 9th in enrollment in two-year institutions. Over 69% of the AA degree graduates continue their education the following year--58% into the SUS, 5% into Independent Colleges, and Universities, and the remaining 6% stay in a community college. Over 70% of the students in the SUS upper division began their education in the Community College System.

Florida's 2+2 system was established based on two premises: 1) that a postsecondary education should be within a 30 minute commute of all Florida citizens; and, 2) that the first two years should be affordable. The decision-makers at that time believed that creating a community college system would meet those two goals and increase access to postsecondary education.

In order to make the 2+2 system successful, several formal and informal policies have been established. Among the formal policies codified in law was the establishment of the articulation agreement and the common course numbering system guaranteeing the transfer of credit. An informal policy was adopted which placed a cap on the number of prior year high school graduates that could enroll in the SUS, thereby ensuring that the majority of students intending to go on for a postsecondary education would enroll in the CCS.

First Time In College (FTIC) Cap

The cap was regulated through the SUS enrollment estimating conference, where legislative appropriations staff members and the Governor's Office determined the number of lower and upper level Full Time Enrollments (FTE) upon which they would base their budgets. Originally, the cap was set at 13%. The remainder of the prior year high school graduates continuing college, approximately 35%, were funded to enroll in the CCS. The Board of Regents 1993 Master Plan adopted a goal to raise the percentage to 20%. Since then, the percentage has increased to nearly 19%. Conversely, the community college FTIC percentage has declined by a similar amount.

The SBCC is concerned that any further expansion in the SUS enrollment goal would result in the state universities enrolling students who would require remediation. PEPC has proposed that rather than setting an artificial cap, the number of enrollments be based on the projected number of high school students that can score above the required SUS admission level on the ACT/SAT.

The CCS has several concerns, including cost, facilities, remedial needs and program alignment, that relate to significant increases in the FTIC cap on state universities. The cost of providing lower division instruction is higher for the SUS than for the CCS. Moving more students into the SUS at this stage of their academic career would create a greater cost for the State, and therefore, potentially fewer funds would be available for assuring student access.

Increasing the percentage of prior year high school graduates from 19 to 25 would increase the number of students served by seven to eight thousand per year. This increase would be in addition to those projected additions based upon the anticipated changes in high school graduates. These thousands of students would require facilities that are again more costly in the SUS than in the CCS.

At the April CCS Strategic Plan Task Force meeting, a BOR report was made and data was presented indicating that the SUS is currently turning away less than 1,000 prepared students. This implies that only about 19 percent of current high school graduates meet SUS requirements and apply to a state university. If the percentage admitted is increased to 25, almost all of the increase will be comprised of students who do not meet SUS entrance requirements and many would need some type of remediation. A large increase in remedial students would have consequences for the SUS in at least two areas.

The most obvious consequence would be in retention and graduation rates. The 1996-97 SUS Fact Book shows a high percentage of FTIC's being graduated and/or retained. Research conducted by ACT indicates that this percentage is directly tied to the incoming academic ability of the students served. As that average ability declines, so will the retention and graduation rates.

The second area is in the academic offerings that would be needed by this student body versus the current one. Less well prepared students need a different type of academic environment than do those who enter with high SAT or ACT scores. The CCS is already set up to offer the full range of academic offerings from honor classes to remedial while the SUS is not. There are a number of legislative initiatives in other states to limit remedial instruction to community colleges. With the exception of FAMU, Florida has had this limit in place since the early 1980's. With the SUS facing significant enrollment pressures in the coming years, this does not appear to be a good time to reverse this policy direction. Indeed, the SUS does not wish to expand its mission in this direction.

The final issue is program vitality. The CCS is currently servicing students with a broad range of academic, economic, and social backgrounds. These students range from the highest academic achievers who have had outstanding high school preparation combined with family and community support, to academically, socially, and economically deprived students. The richness of the social and academic mixture of these students provides a teaching and learning environment that is clearly beneficial to both extremes of this diverse group of students. The CCS is concerned that if public universities take too many additional students who are at the well-prepared and supported end of this group, this robust educational environment in our classrooms will be weakened.

The current language in the SUS Strategic Plan states:

> The Board of Regents, therefore, establishes the goal that the State University System will accept as First-Time-in-College students within the system all qualified Florida high school graduates who meet the admissions criteria adopted by the Board of Regents, up to a maximum of 25 percent of the previous year's high school graduating class, with no significant increase in out-of-state or alternative admissions. (P 39)

Access needs will best be met by maintaining SUS admissions standards and a joint BOR/SBCC initiative to assure a four year college experience is available in all Florida communities of significant size is under development. Concurrent use campuses, comprised of SUS offerings on existing community college campuses, will allow access to be expanded and baccalaureate production to increase within Florida's current successful 2+2 model.

Objective: The number of SUS entering lower level FTE will be regulated in a manner that recognizes the integrity of the 2+2 system. The BOR and SBCC will jointly develop a plan to increase effective postsecondary education access in Florida through a network of concurrent use campuses located on existing community college sites.

Governance/Trustee Training

One of the guiding principles of the Florida Community College System is that community colleges are best governed by local boards of trustees and coordinated by a State Board. The aim of this principle is to foster maximum feasible local control while preserving appropriate legal accountability to the State. Since the primary mission of the community college is to serve the needs of its community, a local governance structure is best suited to that purpose. However, it is equally important to recognize that the twenty-eight community colleges also need consistency and uniformity in curricular offerings, degrees and certificates awarded, fee structures, report requirements, and compliance with Florida laws and rules as they relate to educational issues. To that end, the SBCC serves an essential coordinating function.

The Florida Senate recently completed a study of community college governance. The staff of the Senate Education Committee reviewed the governance structure of the CCS and its relationship to state higher education policy initiatives. The study confirmed that there was a Arelatively high level of satisfaction with the current governance structure@ and that it should be maintained. The results of this study confirmed the information gathered during the public hearing phase of the planning process. The CCS maintains that the current governance system with local boards of trustees and a statewide coordinating board is the most appropriate model to assure both unique community needs as well as statewide workforce needs are addressed.

In order to foster appropriate local governance, the SBCC assists and facilitates trustee training across the State. There is a Trustee Training Committee that is a component of the State Board of Community Colleges. The members do not believe that the role of the State Board is to interfere with the relationship that a college president has with his or her board of trustees. The State Board believes that there is a role for the State Board to play in objectively introducing trustees of the twenty-eight community colleges to other options of operational and developmental policy for the community colleges.

Although there had been statutory requirements for each board of trustees to evaluate its president, there were concerns by legislators and others that some boards would go for extended periods of time without doing any type of formal evaluation of its president. Because of this, the Legislature has, over the last several years, strengthened laws concerning requirements for annual presidential evaluations and specifying issues that must be included in those evaluations.

As a result of concerns about boards understanding both their responsibilities for evaluating the community college presidents, and their role as policy makers, the SBCC began an annual trustee training program.

Objective: Trustee training is essential to the community college governance idea of local control. The SBCC will include monies to support trustee training in its budget request and will develop a means of recognizing those institutions with formally trained/certified trustees. Preference for re-appointment should be given to persons who complete this process.

Planning Context

In "The Price of Admission," by John Immerwahr, The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education noted that

> .... recent years, education has been at or near the top of the public's economic concerns and it has been a major priority for the president and many of the nation's governors. When leaders and the public speak of education, however, their main concern has typically been the nation's K-12 schools. Today, the focus is turning to higher education (including both two-year and four-year colleges and universities). As America moves into the knowledge-intensive world of the future, a college education will continue to take on much of the importance that a high school education had a generation ago: the growing importance of a higher education has spawned greater public attention and concern.

To examine public perception of higher education, the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education conducted a national survey with the following results:

- $ Americans believe that higher education is more important than it ever has been, both as a key to a middle-class lifestyle and as a resource for the local economy.
- $ Because higher education has become so important, Americans are convinced that no qualified and motivated student should be denied an opportunity to go to a college or university merely because of the price.
- $ While many Americans are still worried about access to higher education, concerns about students being shut out of a college education have decreased significantly in the last five years.
- $ The public believes that what a student gets out of a higher education is a function of what he or she puts into it.
- $ The public is opposed to policy proposals that limit access to higher education or raise the amount families will have to pay, but has not come to a consensus on how society should pay for access to higher education.

Any effective strategic plan for Florida's twenty-eight colleges must begin with an awareness of the community and the state each college and the overall Community College System is charged with serving. The context of the community colleges consists of the external environment, which includes all the factors outside of the institution that affect how the colleges function, and the internal environment, which consists of all the factors within the institution that affect how the colleges perform their mission. The external environment embraces such elements as demographic, social, economic, technological, political, and educational forces affecting the colleges. The internal environment includes such factors as enrollments, student characteristics, student outcomes, the

quality of academic programs and student services, and the availability and uses of resources. External and internal factors are most useful in planning when they are expressed as trends and events with forecasts for the future. These trends and events predict both opportunities and threats to the well-being of institutions. They are important because their identification is the first step in preparing strategic plans for the future.

The Florida Chamber of Commerce has identified as its No. 1 priority the need for "well-educated and trained employees." The National Council on Competitiveness "singled out worker skills as the greatest competitive challenge the nation faces in the next decade." Enterprise Florida says a skilled workforce recurs as one of the top three factors when businesses decide where to locate or expand. Supplying an able Florida workforce will require new levels of collaboration among all higher education providers.

The External Environment

The levels and effects of educational attainment are inherently linked to one another as success at one level increases the chances of success in the other. Data show that parents' educational level is a good predictor of a student's educational preparation level. Parents who do not complete their education are more likely to have children who do not complete their education. As a result of this interdependence, a cycle is created which serves to reinforce itself generation after generation.

An examination of educational attainment in relation to data on income inequality outlines per capita income differences for the white and black population of 14 large (and southern) states, as well as the dollar and percentage difference. Disturbingly, Florida stands out as having the largest income gap between the races. Six of the seven states with the largest income gap have the lowest baccalaureate degree completion rates.

The Commission on Government Accountability to the People's (GAP) report, Critical Benchmark Goals, indicates that the average wage in Florida lags behind the U.S. average (by 11 percentage points), yet the per capita income is slightly above the national average, due in part to the income of our large retirement population. While gaps in income are intriguing yardsticks to gauge economic opportunity and progress directly, other social indicators should also be considered. Two such indicators of societal impacts reported by GAP are the violent crime rate and percent of citizens living in poverty. Florida performs poorly on both measures. As of 1994, no other state had a higher rate of violent crime than Florida. Only 12 other states have a higher percentage of people living in poverty. These two social conditions are indirect reflections of Florida's higher educational attainment levels.

According to many experts, the children of Florida's working age population are the most vulnerable portion of the population. For example, the Annie E. Casey Foundation, a private Baltimore charity, ranks Florida 48th in the health and welfare of its children. This ranking is a composite of ten different indicators, including percentage of children in poverty, infant mortality rate, juvenile violent crime rate, and child death rates. The foundation further states that the ranking is indirectly related to educational opportunity and degree attainment.

The century that begins in the year 2000 will bring demanding new challenges to postsecondary education, and especially to the community colleges. Community colleges with their history of providing educational opportunity will face the challenge of achieving educational equity. Two reports have appeared on the national and local scene that should spur the already pressed Community College System in Florida. These reports are Harold Hodgkinson's *Demographic Look at Tomorrow*, published in 1992 by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and *Florida's Workforce 2000*, published in 1988 by the Florida Department of Labor and Employment Security. While the demographic and economic forecasts for the nation are provocative, the predictions for Florida can be termed as startling. A few key points represent an "environmental imperative" for the community colleges:

- The community college population continues to grow from 191,686 in 1991-92 to 193,105 in 1995-96 full-time equivalent degree-seeking students. The projection for the year 2003 is 196,314.

- By the year 2000, Florida is expected to rank third in the country in terms of total population; the minority population has increased by 52.3% since 1980, and the youth population is expected to be 52.4% non-white by the year 2010.

- The workforce will be divided into two classes of jobs, those at the lower end, paying subsistence wages and those at the upper end requiring substantial educational preparation and offering economic success.

Population Patterns

Over the next five years, Florida's demographics are projected to change in two ways - the number of people and the ethnic distribution. The population aged 18 and over is anticipated to increase by slightly over one million, from 11.7 million to 12.8 million. A major increase will occur in the number of people over fifty as the original baby boomers reach that milestone. A second major population change will be among the 18-24 year olds as the children of those original baby boomers, sometimes known as the ABaby Boom Echo,@ complete their K-12 education and come of age. The smallest change will be for those in the middle, the 25-49 year old group.

The second major change will be in ethnic composition. The younger segments of the State's population are becoming more minority, especially Hispanic. The US Census Bureau projects that the overall proportion of Hispanics in Florida will grow from 13.8% in 1995 to 17.5% in 2010. During this same period, the percentage of non-Hispanic blacks will increase slightly from 13.7% to 14.1% and non-Hispanic whites will decline from 70.7% to 66.1%. The anticipated change in the ethnic composition of Florida will require a rededication on the part of the State to ensure that all segments of our population are provided access to postsecondary education. Among all sectors of postsecondary education in Florida, the CCS remains the major entry point for minority students seeking degrees and certificates. The System is committed to continuing to provide both access and support services that will allow these students to reach their educational goals.

The CCS will be impacted by these changes in a number of different ways. The vast majority of individuals age 50 and over are enrolled in Continuing Education courses. Even those taking credit courses tend to be non-degree seeking. Clearly, these students are taking courses for their personal enrichment, or to acquire specific workforce skills related to their current employment, not to earn a credential. While this type student is supported by college services, they tend not to need the same level of service as required by full-time degree seeking individuals, nor are they currently included in Performance Based Program Budgeting calculations.

The 18-24 years old are definitely seeking a credential. Two-thirds of the students enrolled in the AA degree program are age 25 or under. About forty percent of the AS degree, PSAV and College Credit Certificate students are 25 or under. The AA degree-seeking students are the largest group that will be moving on to upper division course work that will lead to the bachelor's. Some in this group will begin to complete high school under new standards that should provide a stronger base for college level work.

However, until the new standards are fully implemented, recent graduates and those students who have been away from academics for a time will need access to College Preparatory courses. Approximately sixty-five percent of the First-Time-in-College students entering in Fall 1997 needed at least one course in one or more areas of remediation.

Economic Development Patterns

The coming population growth and the significantly increased proportions of minorities are even more pivotal events in the context of the projected economic environment. The economy of the state of Florida is expected to produce 2 million new jobs by the year 2000. Services and trades will account for 70% of the job growth, with health careers and business services, including computer related occupations, accounting for half of the services sector increase. The workforce needs in these occupations, as in many other occupations, will require broader educational backgrounds and higher skill levels. Specifically, the minority population must enter and become successful participants in the educational system if they are to avoid low-end, low-pay jobs in the future and if severe labor shortages are also to be prevented. As Harold Hodgkinson reported in *Demographic Look at Tomorrow...*

1. If more minorities graduate from high school and take some community college course training, 1.2 million new health technology jobs will be waiting;

2. If minorities drop out of high school, 4.2 million new service jobs will be waiting, of which three million are minimum wage and can be done by high school dropouts; and,

3. If minorities go to college and graduate, 3.5 million new professional jobs (lawyers, doctors, teachers, accountants, etc.) will be waiting.

The message of the forecast for the state of Florida is indeed an imperative for community colleges. The CCS addresses that imperative via a call for the establishment of partnerships at the state and local level to support broad-based, multi-lateral economic development initiatives and strategies. Education will become the determining influence for full participation in economic success, especially for minorities but also for all peoples. As stated in *Greater Expectations: the South's Workforce is the South's Future*, a study released by MDC, a panel of southern business, academic and public leaders:

> The south cannot compete successfully with a workforce shaped by its traditionally low levels of education and heavy concentration of low-skill jobs.... [The South must] place a high priority on their historically underfunded and undervalued technical and community colleges and place them at the center of the new workforce development system.

Wages and Workforce Development

Recent state and federal legislation designed to change the welfare system signal dramatic new directions for community colleges in servicing vocational and adult education needs. These changes, coupled with a shift to performance based incentive funding, assure a continued leadership role for the colleges in developing Florida's ever evolving workforce.

Regional Work and Gain Economic Self-sufficiency (WAGES) and Workforce Development (WD) boards have been formed to oversee moving welfare clients into work, as well as other labor force issues. One category of Awork@ for adults includes vocational education in programs of 12 months or less duration. Initially, federal legislation allowed 20% of a state's entire welfare caseload to be in this category. The Balanced Budget Act (BBA) of 1997, however, substantially reduced the percentage by requiring more participants to be employed. The BBA of 1997 now permits only 7.5% of the caseload to be counted as Aworkers@ while they are in an educational program. The expectation of major new vocational programs and services designed to handle a large volume of WAGES clients has been reduced accordingly.

Performance Based Incentive Funding (PBIF) keyed to WD and WAGES indicators will fund the development and maintenance of many programs at the colleges. State law now requires that each college set aside part of their annual budget to be earned back, in competition with other educational entities, based on their performance on various WD and WAGES measures or indicators. WD measures require the identification of program completers and their occupational placement and success in jobs that are specifically identified as targeted occupations. WAGES indicators provide incremental incentive funding calculated on client enrollment, program completion, job placement and job retention, again in specified occupational areas. This incentive funding will drive college decisions to maintain or develop programs tailored to employer demands statewide and will require the colleges to work closely with organized labor and other community based organizations, local and statewide economic development agencies, public assistance and employment agencies, and the Florida Department of Children and Family Services and the Department of Labor and Employment Security.

The Internal Environment

Trends and events in the internal environment of Florida's community colleges should result in as much change and growth as suggested by external environmental factors. The twenty-eight colleges have systematically collected information and prepared reports for the Florida Division of Community Colleges containing historic and projected data in several critical areas that affect the Strategic Plan. Specifically, these areas include student and program enrollments, fiscal data, and personnel data. In the following subsections, information about the patterns in the specified areas is presented both in terms of current status and future projections.

Enrollment Projections

Enrollment projections are based upon assumptions that are influenced by many factors. A major component of higher education enrollment projections is the high school graduation rate. This rate is the factor that is also experiencing the most change. As the high school student body has increased in the percentage of ethnic minorities, there has been an accompanying shift in progression and graduation rates. At this time, minority students do not finish high school at the same rate as majority students. Much of the difference in the rate for Hispanics is explained by the place of birth. Nationally, foreign-born Hispanics have a high school dropout rate that is almost three times that of native-born Hispanic students. (Forgione, 1998) As a major immigration point for Hispanics, Florida's high schools enroll many foreign born students and feel the impact of this situation.

A second factor that may have a short-term effect on high school graduation rates is the new graduation standards. The State recently raised the high school graduation standards to include Algebra I and an overall GPA of 2.0. While students have shown time and again that they will rise to meet tougher standards, there is often a short time lag between the implementation of higher standards and the return to the previous graduation rate.

The projected increase in headcount enrollment developed by PEPC for 2010 for credit students was 258,746. This number was never officially broken down by sector. Informally, one distribution, often discussed, was 100,000 for the SUS, 25,000 for the independent sector and the remaining 125,000 for the CCS.

The PEPC results were an average of numbers based upon several different projection methods. While this had the advantage of incorporating the strengths of the different methods, it did not necessarily lead to the best projection for a particular sector.

Since the projections were first done by PEPC, two more years of high school graduation data have become available. Also the SUS and CCS have both conducted internal sector based projections. These sector based projections tried to use a single method that was representative of the best method for the particular set of institutions. For example, the CCS is the only college credit granting sector that provides an AA, an AS, and a certificate. Each of these programs attracts a different type of student. This can be seen in the different age distribution patterns of the programs.

The AA pattern is similar to that of the SUS, but even there, the percent of students under the age of 25 is much less. This implies that the upcoming increase in the 18-24 year old segment of Florida's population will not impact the two systems in the same way.

When the SUS redid the projections based upon their system profile, the anticipated increase by 2010 was 70,000 undergraduates. Given that only a small portion of the CCS student body is prior year high school graduates, the internal enrollment projections were based upon projected age distributions. Using a ratio methodology, the increase by 2007 for the CCS was 51,000 credit and an additional 26,000 non-credit for a total of 77,000 students. If this same growth rate were projected out to 2010, the numbers would be 65,000 for credit and 33,000 for non-credit for a total of 98,000 more students than are currently being served.

Student performance information also reveal an important trend that affect the future of community college enrollment. Specifically, the increasing numbers of students enrolling in the Community College System who require College Preparatory work decreases AA & AS production. Approximately 65% of students enrolling in community colleges now require some preparatory academic work. Since a significant percentage of students in need of remedial coursework fail to move on to credit classes, this has a significant enrollment impact. Students who do move on to credit courses graduate in similar numbers to those students who entered "college ready".

GED

There is a real need for the GED (General Educational Development) in Florida. Presently, the GED accounts for 28% of the high school diplomas or its equivalent issued. This percentage has been growing because the number of GED diplomas has grown a great deal faster than the number of high school diplomas each year. Florida has one of the highest dropout rates in the U.S. and there are many immigrants who come to Florida who do not have high school certification. People without high school certification are less likely to be able to obtain jobs and are more likely to need public assistance. However, only a very small percentage of the target populations are being reached who could benefit from obtaining a GED. Of the 2,541,872 people in Florida in 1995 aged 16 and older who did not have a high school diploma, only 1.5% of them received their GED diploma.

In 1995-96, ten of the Florida community colleges were responsible for the GED instruction in 14 counties. There were 14,595 people (unduplicated) who attended the GED Preparatory classes in 1995-96 with a budget for these classes of $3,150,940. The colleges offered classes in which students received instruction and tutoring in the five skill areas covered on the GED--writing skills, mathematics, social studies, science, and interpreting literature and the arts. Faculty represented both full-time and part-time instructors, and their teaching methodologies incorporated traditional classroom instruction, videotaped program instruction, and computerized self-paced instruction. The number of people who passed the GED tests at the community college testing centers and received their GED diploma during 1995-96 was 3,499; however, it is not known how many of those test takers had been in GED Prep classes.

GED graduates performed as well or slightly better than the high school graduates on the community college entry level placement test for reading and writing, but did very much worse on the math. In 1995-96, only 20.7% the GED graduates passed the math entry-level test while 47.4% of the high school graduates passed it. For the reading entry level placement test, 74.2% of the GED graduates passed and 67.2% of the high school graduates passed. The passing rate for the writing test was 67.3% for the GED graduates and 64.5% for the high school graduates. The four years of data included in a Level III GED program review indicated an increase in math College Prep (remedial) enrollment for the GED graduates, but a decrease for the high school graduates.

GED graduates do not progress to their sophomore year at the same rate as high school graduates. During the four years of the Level III review GED graduates showed over one-third fewer students enrolled during the sophomore year compared to the freshmen enrollment. For the high school graduates there are approximately 1.0% fewer sophomores enrolled in fall 1995 compared to freshmen in fall 1994. One reason for this is that a higher percentage of high school graduates finished College Prep classes than did GED graduates.

Objective: Provide more intensive training in the basic skills in the GED Preparatory classes Individuals passing the GED tests are not able, in 79% of the cases, to pass the community college entry-level math test. Support the recommendation of the Workforce Development Task Force, which advocates raising the passing scores to 45 on the five GED tests.

Objective: The Division of Community Colleges, in cooperation with the colleges, should develop an MIS process at the state and local level to track the performance of students in GED preparatory classes on the GED tests. The development of such a database would enable more effective assessment of GED test performance of students taking GED preparatory classes as compared with students who took no classes before testing.

Current enrollments and the need to keep up with the changes in the composition of the population and improve the rates of student success represent a monumental issue and challenge for the Florida community colleges.

Articulation efforts with K-12 have been strengthened during the past year as one means of reducing the need for remedial instruction. The State Board has representation on the K-12 Accountability Commission, has worked to assist in the implementation of the Sunshine State Standards, and has supported both the raising of standards for the high school diploma and the development of a College Ready Diploma for high school students who take the college preparatory track and pass the required courses. The CCS has also provided opportunities for high school students to take the college placement examination while still in high school to ameliorate their academic shortcomings prior to college entry. Specific objectives to enhance the State Board's effort to assure a seamless Pre-K-16 educational experience for Florida residents are outlined as part of the Access Challenge (page 26).

Program Enrollment Patterns

The majority of students in the community colleges enroll in two areas: A&P courses (primarily for those intending to transfer with an Associate in Arts Degree) and vocational courses which provide the majority of course work for AS Degree programs and vocational certificate programs (for those preparing for occupational and technical careers). Currently, the proportions of FTE=s generated by these two areas are 51% in A&P and 27% in vocational.

Enrollment growth in the CCS will probably be due more to the programmatic changes that have taken place the past two years than to population changes. The 1997 Legislature enacted SB (Senate Bill) 1688. This bill allowed all twenty-eight community colleges to offer Postsecondary Adult Vocational (PSAV) and Adult Education programs. Prior to that time, responsibility for offering these programs had been assigned to either the community college or local school board that served a given county. Only about half of the community colleges were offering these programs. Major shifts in these two areas are anticipated for the next five years as more colleges begin to offer this type of program and as local school districts review their offerings. Indeed, several local school boards have discussed placing their complete emphasis on K-12 programs and shifting adult and vocational enrollments to the local community college.

College Attendance

Based upon information obtained from the State Library, Florida - at 14.3% - has the third highest dropout rate in the nation. In addition, a larger and larger percentage of high school graduates are receiving non-standard diplomas (DOE). *Postsecondary Education OPPORTUNITY* shows the 1996 public high school graduation rate for Florida at 57.6% (March 1998). This rate is the number of 1995-96 regular public high school graduates divided by the number of ninth grade students enrolled in public school in the fall of 1992[1]. Using this same definition for all fifty states, Florida is 47th in the nation and about ten points below the national average high school graduation rate of 67.9%. PEPC is conducting a longitudinal study of the high school class of 1993-94. Part of that study was an attempt to determine the percentage of high school graduates who had taken the full set of SUS and CCS proscribed courses for college readiness and made at least a 3.0 GPA. Their findings indicated that only about 22% of the students in that high school class were fully prepared for college when they finished high school.

The combination of high dropout rates and low preparation rate has led to a low chance of educational continuation. *OPPORTUNITY* shows the chance for college by age 19 for someone from Florida as 29.1 percent. Again, Florida is 47th in the nation and about ten points below the US average of 39.7%.

---

[1] This definition of high school graduation rate is different from that normally used by the Division of Public Schools or NCES. It is an attempt at a cohort rate, but does not consider the effect of migration among states and thus probably understates the true cohort rate. It is included here because the same technique was used on the data for all fifty states.

Although the national Graduation Rate Survey, conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), shows that Florida's community college graduation rates are in line with other states such as California, and the National Transfer Assembly data indicate that our community college students transfer to four-year colleges at slightly above the national average, there is still room for improvement. The Division of Community Colleges has been providing accountability data on retention and graduation to each college for the past four years. These data have allowed the individual colleges to develop peer benchmarks that can be used internally as part of their strategic planning and institutional effectiveness processes.

No matter whether one considers job growth, job number or entry level wages, the projected need for college certificates and/or associate degrees is approximately 60% of the workforce. The percentage of the population at these educational levels in 1990 was 26. Since the jobs being considered do not represent the entire range of jobs that will be available in 2005, the projected need level can be met with less than 60% of the total population at these levels. However, it is clear that these are the jobs of the future and a long range goal of having 45-60% of the prior year high school graduates entering the CCS appears to be an appropriate figure in order to prepare today's students for tomorrow's jobs.

The CCS is currently enrolling about thirty percent (30%) of the prior year high school graduates. This percentage is expected to increase in the coming years as the Alevel playing field of 1688@ is implemented. Senate Bill 1688 allowed all twenty-eight community colleges to provide both Adult Education and Postsecondary Adult Vocational courses. This means fourteen community colleges that could not provide these courses before will now be able to expand their offering to include these areas of instruction.

These new offerings will mean an increase in the CCS percentage of prior year high school graduates. The CCS will need to increase the level of enrollment of prior year high school graduates by fifty percent to bring the total percentage from the current level of 30% to the minimally required level of 45%. The way to reach this goal is not by decreasing the enrollments of other sectors of postsecondary education, but rather to work with the K-12 system so that:

- more students complete high school and receive a standard diploma;
- more students are prepared to continue their education after high school;
- more students actually go on to further postsecondary education; and,
- more students are retained and complete either a certificate and/or associate degree.

Implications

1. A projected increase in headcount of 2% per year is projected between now and the year 2010.

2. The need for a strong College Preparatory Program will remain.

3. The need to expand and support the College Reach Out Program is evident.

4. In order to meet the labor force educational requirements for the next century, the CCS needs to increase the percentage of prior year high school graduates enrolled from the current 30 to 45.

The Florida Community College System is the lynchpin of workforce development, whether the job requires a baccalaureate, an associate degree, a certificate, or customized skill upgrading.

Fiscal Patterns

Fiscal patterns also affect the future of the community colleges. Community colleges receive most of their revenue from state legislative allocations from the general revenue and the lottery; the balance of revenue is derived from student fees. Since 1991-92, the overall revenue for community colleges has increased from $3,926 per FTE to $5,336 per FTE in 1997-98. The general revenue allocation has increased over the same period from $2,262 to $3,467. Student fees have increased from $995 to $1,276 during this same period. Projected requirements for capital construction and improvements over the next five years is in excess of $2 billion, while the projected community college share of the PECO appropriations over the same time frame is $635 million, leaving a cumulative and significant unmet need of $1.36 billion. The primary issue faced by all community colleges is fiscal stability and fiscal capacity for meeting the educational needs of a growing student population with even greater needs for academic support for student success.

Personnel Patterns

Florida community colleges currently employ 33,530 full and part-time personnel. The categories of these employees are the following: instructional (52%), secretarial (18%), professional (10%), technical and paraprofessional (9%), service and maintenance (8%), executive and managerial (2%), and skilled crafts (2%). There are four issues that especially affect the future of community colleges with respect to personnel. First, the proportion of minorities in all employee categories, although better than four years ago, is not yet reflective of the population composition. Second, a considerable portion of the faculty in community colleges are nearing retirement, and their replacement, particularly in fields of critical personnel shortages, will be difficult. Third, the salaries of the full-time faculty of the community colleges are significantly lower than other segments of the higher education system within the state of Florida as well as nationally. This will be another influential

factor as we strive to find qualified replacements for retiring faculty. Finally, while the Community

College System relies on the assistance of part-time faculty to meet instructional needs, the System average shows that 61% of total credit hours are taught by full-time faculty. The future of the Florida community colleges will be affected by the ability of the colleges to maintain the quality of the teaching faculty, equalize the compensation system for the faculty, and increase the proportion of minorities employed by all the colleges.

The professionalism that community college faculty bring to their interaction with students is characterized by the introduction to the Academic Ethics Statement recently developed by the Community College Faculty Leaders= Coalition of Florida which states:

> Faculty, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. To this end faculty devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty.

Providing effective staff support to assure this type of quality instructor is able to remain current in his/her teaching discipline will be another of the many challenges faced by the CCS in the next five years. (The complete Academic Ethics Statement is included as Appendix C of this Strategic Plan.)

Staff and Program Development

Rule 6A-14.029 F.A.C. states that A . . . effective July 1, 1996, each community college shall allocate from its available resources for current operations during the fiscal year, an amount not less than two percent of the previous year's allocation from the state community college program fund to fund staff and program development activities." Several colleges have utilized these resources to conduct faculty and staff development activities related to the technological delivery of instruction. The Florida setaside for staff development has received national acclaim and the American Association of Community College Futures report called on all states to enact the 2% allocation.

Additionally, as a result of a special appropriation provided during fiscal year 1994-95, several colleges and universities were awarded distance learning demonstration grants. One such grant was awarded to the Central Florida Consortium of Higher Education which is comprised of the University of Central Florida and the following community colleges: Brevard Community College, Central Florida Community College, Daytona Beach Community College, Lake-Sumter Community College, Seminole Community College, and Valencia Community College.

The outcome of this consortium's demonstration grant was a series entitled Beyond Chalk. This series provides instruction to faculty members on the integration of technology into their curriculum. The series is currently marketed nationally by PBS.

As the Florida Community College System moves into the new century, critical to its success will be

the faculty and staff hired to facilitate student learning. Currently, the System employs 33,530 full and part-time personnel--50% of which are instructional employees. There are five major issues that need to be addressed to assure that quality employees carry out the vision and mission of the colleges. First, Florida will be one of the most diverse populations in the United States. Community college faculty, administrators, and other staff need to reflect that diversity more concretely. Furthermore, the skills of college personnel should reflect their preparation to utilize varying models of instruction, including the use of available and adaptive equipment for the benefit of students with disabilities.

Second, a considerable portion of the population is nearing retirement. When they do, many vacant positions will need to be filled. Consideration should be given to hiring a diverse group of employees. Third, as the colleges seek replacements for the newly retired, they will have opportunities to reassess what type of faculty member would best fit the new paradigm of learning-centered colleges. Hiring people who share the vision, mission, and direction toward which the institutions are headed will assist the colleges in more fully achieving their respective goals. Fourth, it will be increasingly imperative that colleges both train and re-train their faculty and staff. Technology, still in its infancy, is bound to make profound differences in how colleges conduct their work. From instruction to learning to advising to record keeping, technology will shape and reshape how these tasks are accomplished. This means everyone will need to be more computer literate and more open to doing familiar tasks in unfamiliar ways. The need for training and renewal is not limited to only technological areas. Comfort with familiar teaching methodologies and traditional ways of serving students will need to give way to greater risk-taking and experimentation both in the classroom, relative to varying learning styles, and in the area of student advising.

Lastly, Florida still lags behind the nation with respect to average faculty salaries. If the State values high quality student learning provided by highly educated professionals, it will support fiscal structures that allow for competitive compensation for outstanding work. This need for retraining and renewal reinforces the value of Rule 6A-14.029 F.A.C.

Objective: The CCS will retain its commitment to Staff and Program Development and will continue to encourage individual institutions to use those funds for upgrading skills in the areas of curriculum development, distance learning, adaptive technology and in teaching students from diverse cultures.

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGES

Adequacy Challenge

Florida's community colleges have made major funding changes in recent years. The first education system to utilize Performance Based Incentive Funding and Performance Based Program Budgeting, Florida's community colleges face a significant challenge in a new, still evolving, workforce funding formula.

As the State makes major policy decisions with regard to workforce education, the community

colleges seek to initiate new programs to meet 21st century needs by maintaining a reasonable funding base, insuring accountable operations and continuing to seek new methods of serving students, business and industry in a cost-effective and responsible manner. Florida's community colleges are the educational delivery system that will increase the State's competitiveness in a global economy.

The colleges face complex funding problems involving inadequate funding, eroding lottery support, and a growing need for workforce readiness programs. In addition, the System must anticipate high wage/high skill training designed to meet the needs of a diverse and increasingly technical economy. A weakened PECO funding source cannot meet current infrastructure needs for either new or renovated facilities currently and definitely not in the future.

Fees

A Florida community college student will pay an average of $1,309 for the 1998-99 academic year for 30 credit hours. Clearly, the value received from this modest investment will have a lifetime rate of return that far exceeds any alternative investments. Tuition represents a small portion of total educational expenses which also includes room, board, books, transportation, clothing and other educational expenses. Total educational costs compared to available resources form the basis upon which the need for student financial aid is calculated. Low student fees reduce the need for student financial aid.

The Bright Futures Scholarship Program, the Hope Scholarship Tax Credit, the Florida Student Assistance Grants (FSAG), and the federal Pell Scholarships all provide significant financial aid to community college students. The Florida Prepaid College Program has been a significant mechanism in helping parents save for college costs. None of these programs have been a major source of financial assistance to the non-traditional, part-time students that represent the principal customers of the Florida Community College System. Low tuition does not represent a good financial aid policy because it does not target aid to the financially needy. Thus, the System is challenged with the need to seek financial assistance for the older, part-time students. Such students are more often challenged with a lack of child care, transportation costs and the loss of wages in addition to the cost of tuition. The State Board of Community Colleges should seek new funding and help to create new initiatives to provide student financial aid to part-time, non-traditional students that will cover the full range of costs incurred by these students.

Currently, student fee revenues represent 26% of the total system's unrestricted current funds (also called Fund 1 revenues). Unrestricted current funds are the primary source for the on-going instructional activities for a college. Within the total funds of a college which include capital outlay funds, auxiliary enterprises and federal funds, student fee revenues represent 19% of the total revenues received by the Florida community colleges in 1996-97. Student fees are a significant source of revenues for the System, and changes in student fee policy will undoubtedly affect the level of revenues needed to accommodate budgetary requirements in the future. In fact, in the past decade, student fee revenues have grown by 123% compared to an increase of 76% in state revenues. Student fee revenues constituted 22% of the unrestricted current fund revenues in 1986-87.

Florida law prescribes that resident students pay a matriculation fee that represents 25% of the prior

year cost for both community colleges and universities. Non-resident students pay full cost. Both delivery systems had reached this legislative policy several years ago. As a result, Florida ranks 32nd nationally among community colleges, and the state ranks 49th nationally among universities in terms of fees. Comparatively speaking, community college students pay 82% of the national average fees, whereas, university students pay only 57% of the national average fees. With an average annual fee level of $1,994 for state universities, differential tuition has not been a significant factor in student choice in attending either a community college or university. In fact, the community college fee level has been at approximately 60% of the university fee level for the past five years.

The December, 1995, joint meeting of the Board of Regents, State Board of Community Colleges and the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission resulted in a motion that called upon the Legislature to allow universities and community colleges flexibility to raise tuition to at least the national average without a reduction in general revenue and to provide adequate student financial assistance. To date, little progress has been made in pursuit of this goal.

In 1998-99, Florida community colleges were appropriated 3.9% of the total state general revenue available to the Legislature for appropriations. Prior to lottery appropriations in 1986-87, the community colleges received 5% of the state general revenue. At the present time it appears unlikely that the community college share of general revenue will increase to any measurable degree. The State of Florida's tax structure is not responsive to the growth needs of the state. The prospect of new taxes is dim. State economists have projected state general revenue growth in the range of 4 to 6 percent over the next decade. This translates into an annual average rate growth of 5% in the general revenue portion of colleges= operating budget. General revenue represents approximately 60% of the revenues in the unrestricted current funds budget. Lottery projections for the next decade reflect an average annual increase of zero percent. Holding all other revenues constant (including student fees), this scenario translates into an annual average of 3% growth in operating budgets. Given that this level is insufficient to fund increasing costs, technology needs and growth, student fees will undoubtedly fund a larger share of college budgets in the future.

College boards of trustees have much flexibility in setting student fee levels. They have the authority to set matriculation and tuition fees at a level that may vary by up to 10% from the standard fee level established annually by the Legislature. There is also authority to charge discretionary fees for student financial aid, student activities and capital improvements within statutory parameters. Colleges also charge laboratory fees, application fees and fees for services. Consideration is given in this fee setting process to the challenges faced by economically disadvantaged students. Colleges have recently been given authority to pledge revenues for capital improvement fees as security in borrowing funds. Capital improvement fees were also embellished by the Legislature by authorizing their use for technology. However, the fee is fixed at $1.00 per credit hour, and there is no mechanism for increase. Similar to the other discretionary fees, the capital improvement fee should be set at a percentage of the matriculation fee.

The processes for instruction and learning are undergoing dramatic change as a result of technological innovations. The lack of a predictable revenue stream hampers the ability of colleges to commit to a long range plan of technology improvement. The instructional, registration, counseling and related educational functions must accommodate the challenges of technology if community colleges are to remain relevant in the future. The creation of a technology fee would

provide a dedicated revenue source that directly benefits students.

Given the need for technology improvements and the uncertainties of the state funding process for Workforce Development, colleges need more flexibility in setting fee levels. They also need the authority to creatively pledge fee revenue streams for debt service generated by facility and technology plans. Greater dependence on student revenues will ultimately raise Florida community college fees.

Objective: The standard matriculation fee will remain at 25% of cost. Boards of trustees should be authorized to establish a matriculation fee that varies no more than 10% below and 15% above the standard fee. The additional 5% flexibility on the upper range of the standard fee should be dedicated to security and safety improvements. A separate technology fee should be statutorily created, and colleges should be authorized to pledge the revenue stream as security against debt. The capital improvement fee should be changed from $1.00 per credit hour to 10% of the matriculation fee.

Facilities

Florida is fortunate to have a very systematic process for providing educational facilities. The Educational Facilities law directs each college to assess, by a survey every five years, their capital outlay needs based on national space standards using projected student enrollments. Each college then develops, on a yearly basis, a five-year plan for their educational facilities needs in a Capital Improvement Program following a prescribed format. Of course the problem has been that the monetary resources cannot finance all of the projected needs. The projected requirements for capital needs of renovation, remodeling and construction over the next five years are in excess of $2 billion, while the projected community college share of the Public Education and Capital Outlay Trust Fund (PECO) appropriations over the same time frame is only estimated at $635 million. PECO is the major funding source for educational facilities for postsecondary education. To provide the facilities needed for the future, the PEPC Master Plan and the study, Florida's Educational Facilities Needs and Funding in the 21st Century by Florida TaxWatch, Inc., both recommended changing the allocation of the PECO funding among the three delivery systems. The PECO allocation of 70 percent to public schools and 15 percent to the State University System and Community College System has developed over time and is not supported by Statute. PECO was originally designed to provide construction funds for postsecondary education and the 1995 Legislature gave the K-12 system an extra 3/4 mill in perpetuity. Due to these changes, the State Board of Community Colleges is joining with the Board of Regents in seeking to restore equity to the PECO allocations by including the following objective in this Strategic Plan:

Objective: The allocation of PECO dollars shall be changed in a manner to restore the original emphasis on higher education. Proposed allocation objectives are 50% for K-12 and 25% each for the SUS and CCS by the year 2000 and an equal partnership of 33.3% each for K-12, the SUS and the CCS by the year 2010.

PEPC recognized in its recent Master Plan for all postsecondary education that the State must provide additional capacity in higher education and is interested in expanding the ability of students

to obtain baccalaureate degrees offered at one location thereby lessening the need for a student to enroll at a different location to complete a degree. Joint-use agreements, partnerships, and the co-location of universities and community colleges will assist in meeting the intent of PEPC=s recommendation. A network of concurrent use campuses to lessen the transfer shock as AA graduates move to state universities will be seriously considered by both the BOR and the SBCC in the coming year.

Access Challenge

There are many facets of providing access to higher education. As these different components are explored, it must be remembered that access is truly available only when all citizens share in it. As part of the latest agreement with the federal government related to the issue of integrating higher education in Florida, the SUS has included in its new Strategic Plan specific objectives to remove racial barriers. Goals include bolstering partnerships with Florida's public schools, community colleges and businesses. The CCS has made similar commitments.

Equity

The mission of the community college is to respond to the educational needs of citizens in the college service district. Reflective of the districts, there is wide diversity among the students enrolled. There are highly notable differences in culture, educational background and preparation, socio-economic status, religious orientation, personal values, aspirations and needs. Serving a diverse population, while adhering to other pressing priorities, presents a unique set of challenges and opportunities for the System.

State and federal laws specifically prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, race, national origin, marital status, or disability in a public entity. The relevant laws provide that no person, shall be excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of a program, service or activity in the college on the basis on sex, race, national origin, marital status, or disability. The individuals of greatest focus among the protected classes identified in the current laws are women, African-Americans, Hispanics, Asians, Pacific Islanders, American Indians, Alaskans, and individuals with disabilities. As public entities, community colleges are subject to compliance with the relevant laws.

Florida community colleges recognize the importance of adhering to statutory mandates. More compelling in maintaining equitable practices is the acceptance of the social responsibility to provide access for all segments of the community. Inherent in the mission is the responsibility to maintain an open-door policy, providing access for many students who, otherwise, may not have the opportunity for higher education in Florida. Further evident is the philosophy that all students deserve an opportunity to matriculate in an environment that encourages inclusion and grants dignity, respect, and support to all students while achieving their goals.

There are many factors that influence or may interfere with achievement of equity. Notwithstanding statutory requirements, the increase in workforce demands, the heightening of academic standards, college and local board commitment, availability of adequate resources, and student response to the challenges of college, are among some of the most prevalent. The degree to which the System can balance efforts in effectively managing success in meeting these complex challenges, while

maintaining equal opportunity and equal access for all students and employees presents a unique opportunity. System success in all areas is the mark of distinct leadership that the System seeks to attain.

It is in this spirit that the CCS accepts some inherent complexities in its mission. It accepts the reality that to uphold the goals of equity and affirmative action means to increase the challenge of achieving efficiency, proficiency and success in other aspects of college operations. More importantly, the System celebrates the enriching tapestry that all students and employees bring to the campus experience.

The specific issues that the colleges face relative to the provision of equal educational access and equal opportunities are numerous and may vary from college to college. There are, however, clearly identifiable and common issues that all colleges are facing and are expected to face over the next five years. These issues are acknowledged and addressed by the State Board of Community Colleges (SBCC) in the specific goals of the SBCC EA/EO Committee, in the Board's review of the Annual Equity Act Update, in the Florida/U.S. Office for Civil Rights partnership review, and in the SBCC legislative budget, accountability program, and performance based measures.

Accordingly, the CCS reaffirms its commitment to ensure the success of all students and employees by:

- $ Strengthening efforts to reduce the disparity between the academic performance, retention and graduation of ethnic minority students and that of non-minority students pursuing degree programs

- $ Enhancing the provision of appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities, particularly in the use of available, reasonably priced adaptive technology

- $ Increasing diversity in the pool of candidates selected as local board members, community college presidents, and as other executives, administrators, managers, and faculty employees

- $ Enhancing opportunities and representation of women in courses and programs leading to mathematics and science-related careers, in athletics, and of women and ethnic minorities in vendor contracting practices at the colleges.

Objective: Each college shall continue and strengthen its efforts to ensure that no student, employee, or citizen is discriminated against, excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of a program, service, or activity provided by the college on the bases of sex, race, national origin, disability, or marital status.

School District/Community College Collaboration

As discussed earlier in the section on College Attendance, in order to meet the employment demands of the next millennium, the CCS will need to increase the level of enrollment of prior year high school graduates by fifty percent to bring the total percentage from the current level of 30% to the minimally required level of 45%. The way to reach this goal is not by decreasing the enrollments of other sectors of postsecondary education, but rather to work with the K-12 system so that:

- more students complete high school and receive a standard diploma;
- more students are prepared to continue their education after high school;
- more students actually go on to further postsecondary education; and,
- more students are retained and complete either a certificate and/or associate degree.

The best method of expanding the pool is through cooperative articulation efforts among public schools, community colleges, and universities. This type effort is essential to the academic success of Florida's students as they progress from one level to another within our educational system. In 1992, a State ad hoc committee met and developed guidelines, *The Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Develop Guidelines to Enhance Articulation Among the Community College, the Public Schools and Universities*, which identified ways for improved interactive communication between community colleges, universities, and public schools to enhance opportunities for student success in college.

Since that time, numerous activities have been put into place at the state and local levels focusing on strategies and activities that help assure the success of our students as they progress from secondary to postsecondary education. A myriad of collaborative activities between public schools and community colleges is currently occurring throughout local school districts. This information is collected and compiled in an annual survey conducted by the Division of Community Colleges= Office of Educational Services and Research. Enumerated below are a few of the cooperative activities and programs currently taking place at the state level.

1. Common Placement Test linked to K-12 Accountability; CPT/FCAT linked with 10th grade plans;

2. Implementation of College Ready Diploma which requires students to take college prep track and pass the CPT or its equivalent to qualify for the diploma;

3. Public Schools and Workforce Development representatives were added to the Articulation Coordinating Committee;

4. Development and distribution of the *Recommended Guidelines for Dual Enrollment Interinstitutional Articulation Agreements*;

5. Communication of college academic and testing requirements to economically disadvantaged students and their parents via newspapers, radio stations, community centers, and literature that specifically targets these groups;

6. Annual distribution of the 8th grade letter to students and their parents recommending students take the college prep track in high school as a remedial

reduction approach;

7. Appointment of Pre-K-16 Liaisons at each community college to provide a link/contact person between community colleges and school districts;

8. Annual Pre-K-16 Articulation Activities Survey conducted to determine collaborative activities between public schools and community colleges;

9. Annual collection and evaluation of dual enrollment interinstitutional articulation agreements;

10. Recognition of Articulation Coordinating Committee as the statewide Pre-K-16 Council; State Board Rule is being amended to indicate this;

11. Development and distribution of a Student Transfer Guide. This Articulation Coordinating Committee project is near completion;

12. College Reach-Out Program (CROP) support (a consortium of institutions that mentor low income and educationally disadvantaged students in grades 6-12 who otherwise would not seek postsecondary education); and,

13. Annual development and distribution of the *Florida Articulation Summary* that examines the various measures that indicate how well Florida is doing in articulation.

Florida's collaborative activities reflect the priority we place on cooperation across pre-K-12 and postsecondary education. Although great strides have been made to enhance articulation between public schools and postsecondary institutions and Florida is ahead of other states with its level of involvement, there remains much to be done. Provided below are several state-level activities that could be used to help focus the critical articulation issues related to the Pre-K-16 process.

1. Develop and submit joint public school/community college/university plans spelling out ways to improve readiness for college. Currently, Section 240.1161(7)(c), F.S., requires schools/institutions to include in their interinstitutional articulation agreements, mechanisms and strategies to reduce the incidence of postsecondary remediation in math, reading, and writing. The $30 million provided to school districts in recent years to address College Readiness should be linked to the remediation reduction plans developed by the local Articulation Councils. It is further recommended that these plans be submitted annually to the Division for an assessment of compliance with this section of law.

2. Beginning last year, high school standards now require Algebra I for graduation. Studies have shown that students perform better if they have also successfully completed Algebra II and Geometry. Over time, expand the high school graduation requirements to include these two subjects.

3. Work with the K-12 system to encourage the utilization of technology to provide distance learning remedial courses to their high school students.

4. Seek a specific appropriation to create an Access Challenge Grant to help recruit more students (up to 45% of prior year high school graduates) to meet workforce demand.

5. Hold joint meetings between the SBCC and the following state associations:

   a. Florida School Board Association (FSBA)
   b. Florida Association of School Administrators (FASA)
   c. Florida Association of District School Superintendents
   d. Florida Association of Secondary School Principals (FASSP)
   e. Florida Association of Elementary School Principals (FAESP)

6. Have Associations= Executive Directors (noted above) speak to Council of Presidents meeting(s).

7. Continue to distribute the annual letter to eighth grade students and their parents encouraging students to take the high school college prep courses needed for admission to the SUS, whether they plan to attend a community college or a university.

8. Align K-12 standards and testing with college placement tests and teacher preparation.

9. Establish local Articulation Councils in every community college district that include state university and school district representation. The goal of the Councils should be to encourage and facilitate all activities that enhance the smooth transition from secondary to postsecondary education. Section 240.1161(1), F.S., states that, "The superintendent and the president shall establish an articulation committee..." and "Each state university president is encouraged to designate a university representative to participate..." At the present time, twenty-one community colleges have established Articulation Councils to focus on K-16 issues at varying levels of involvement. The Division should include in its review of the interinstitutional articulation agreements an analysis of the status of the local Councils in each area.

As machines have taken over many of the physical skills previously required of workers, the new desired skills have become more intellectual. Today's worker is expected to be able to not only read, write, and compute, but also to think critically and have a broader understanding of where his particular task fits into the overall company processes. This preparation needs to begin prior to the students= arrival on campus. The "college ready" diploma and the Sunshine State Standards are examples of the renewed emphasis on the interdependency of the Pre-K-16 system.

Objective: *The State Board of Education should maintain the new standards for high school*

graduation, provide increased academic support, and evaluate their effectiveness on a periodic basis.

While this emphasis is helping prepare those students currently in the K-12 system, many of today's community college students are returning adults who either did not take college preparatory classes in high school or have been out of secondary school for several years and have forgotten those skills. In order to allow these individuals to proceed to better jobs, the colleges must continue to provide entry level skills in both the technical and the transfer tracks.

The idea of a seamless Pre-K-16 system is often portrayed as going one-way, from kindergarten through the baccalaureate. However, one must remember that there is also a flow from the university level back to kindergarten and other grade levels via teacher education. The CCS is committed to joining the SUS in strengthening preservice and in-service education courses and programs in order to recruit, prepare, support, and retain greater numbers of competent educators. Most of the students preparing to be teachers begin their college career in the CCS, and these future teachers take most of their subject area requirements from community colleges. Therefore it is imperative that the CCS continue to work with the SUS Colleges of Education to provide the appropriate preservice courses. Also, many teachers use community college courses and facilities to meet their in-service requirements. One way the CCS can meet these needs is by having the appropriate courses available via the video network that is being established across the CCS.

Objective: The SBCC shall maintain College Preparatory courses while working with the K-12 system to increase standards and working with the SUS to ensure the CCS component of teacher preparation is appropriate and content rigorous.

Postsecondary Education Planning Commission Access Responses

After examining the current capacity of the different sectors of higher education and the anticipated growth over the next decade, PEPC concluded that the State must provide additional capacity in order to meet the needs for higher education. Instead of recommending a single solution, they developed a list of possible responses and concluded that it would take a combination of several in order to produce the desired outcome. Those responses were as follows:

- Increase enrollment at each existing SUS institution.
- Establish a state college system.
- Authorize community colleges to offer selected baccalaureate degrees.
- Increase the number of joint-use facilities at community colleges and state universities.
- Increase the state subsidy to in-state students attending Florida private institutions.
- Increase the use of distance learning and instructional technology.

These responses were presented as means of producing more baccalaureate degrees. It is assumed the underlying context for the assumption of not enough baccalaureate degrees is economic. PEPC Report 6, 1991, states, "If Florida is to continue to achieve its goal of securing for its citizens a reasonable share of the world's economic success, it must become a national leader in educating its people," (page 4). Also included in that same report is the statement, A...47th in bachelor's degree production. This level of performance will not be adequate for the state and its citizens to meet their

economic goals," (page A-9). But what are the projected economic needs for the next ten years?

The handout presented by PEPC at the March 27, 1997, Strategic Plan Committee meeting indicated that high demand occupations paying more than $9 per hour[2] and requiring four years of college would average 35,508 openings per year from 1996-2006. In addition to the "Require Four Years of College" category, there was one labeled "Management." The exact educational requirements for these positions are not stated, but if one assumes that half of these openings need four-year degrees, then the total openings requiring bachelor's are approximately 44,000. If one assumes seventy-five percent of the management category requires four years, then the total increases to 48,500. In 1992-93, Florida produced slightly over 43,000 degrees (NCES, 1996) so the need, i.e., the gap between anticipated job openings and degrees currently being produced, ranges between 1,000 and 5,500 annually. These numbers imply the annual production of bachelor's should be increased between two and thirteen percent. The opening of a tenth university should go a long way towards meeting this need, albeit it will take several years for Florida Gulf Coast University to achieve full degree production.

While the number of job openings requiring bachelor's may seem high, they represent only thirty-six to thirty-nine percent of the anticipated job openings at this wage level. PEPC=s data indicate that forty percent of the openings will require two-years of postsecondary education and twenty percent will require a high school diploma. The average number of openings at the associate and certificate level is approximately 50,000. If the percent of management jobs requiring a four-year degree is reduced to fifty, the average number of openings needing two-year awards increases to 54,500. In 1992-93, the State produced approximately 40,000 associates. Using the same process as was used for the bachelor's, production of associates needs to be increased between twenty-five and thirty-six percent to meet anticipated demands.

Even though Florida ranks 5th in associate degrees and 46th in bachelors' degrees produced per 100,000 18-44 year olds, the gap between current production and anticipated need is greater at the associate and certificate level than at the baccalaureate. Current production does not meet the anticipated economic need in either case. This gap results in Florida's having to import degree holders from other states, e.g., the large number of K-12 teachers with out-of-state degrees. This in-migration of teachers and other baccalaureate trained workers further reduces the 2 to 13 percent group noted earlier, and must be considered in planning discussions for such growth states as Florida and Texas.

Thus, the SBCC believes there is a need to increase the number of all types of degrees granted in the state. Further, we agree that a variety of approaches are needed and are excited about the increasing opportunities for our students to access the SUS, especially such concurrent use campus approaches as the one under review at St. Petersburg Junior College.

A recent study by the Florida Senate, "Increasing Access to Baccalaureate Degrees: Evaluation of

---

[2] A person employed for a full year (2,080 hours) at nine dollars per hour would earn approximately 112% of the average poverty threshold for a family of four. (1997 threshold estimated from data contained in Table 5.46, *Florida Statistical Abstract 1995*.)

Higher Education Joint-use Facilities," investigated the current level of access to the baccalaureate in the state via both public and private joint-use facilities and programs. The major study recommendations were that 1) an independent agency such as PEPC should verify the need for new degrees before programs are initiated, 2) the local educational site should conduct the survey that determines the need for degree programs and then request the degree programs that are to be validated, and 3) there should be an articulated agreement for the AS degree. The first two recommendations are consistent with the process being proposed by the CCS for community colleges to offer baccalaureate degrees (see the Workforce Baccalaureate section below) and the third is discussed in the section entitled Formal Articulation Policies (page 37). The CCS agrees that PEPC should be a major player in any community college baccalaureate program approval process. Their past service to the State as a "think tank" in terms of higher education policy issues, and their public and independent college perspective, puts them in a unique position to evaluate the need for additional baccalaureate programs.

In addition, to further enhance the 2+2 "Access" model in Florida, the SBCC and the BOR have agreed to develop a joint plan to provide a network of concurrent use campuses statewide. Such campuses will reduce the transfer shock associated with moving to a new community to complete the baccalaureate degree.

All sectors of higher education, both public and private, should endeavor to continue working together in as many ways as possible. Many sectors have been collaborating for years. More formal processes are probable as the state moves into additional relationships as part of the Pre-K-16 initiative. The distance learning enhancement option proposed by PEPC is developed in a subsequent section of this Strategic Plan.

Objective: The CCS will continue to work with the SUS in developing joint programs, joint facilities, concurrent use campuses and other appropriate responses to meet the need to increase access to postsecondary education programs. An SUS/CCS Task Force shall be established to develop a plan for a statewide network of concurrent use campuses.

Workforce Baccalaureate

The successful workforce of the emerging global information economy will require new forms of preparation and credentials. Accordingly, as the knowledge base for professional work in technical disciplines becomes increasingly sophisticated and competitive, there is increasing employer demand for performance-ready graduates at the baccalaureate level. Required is a new practitioner-oriented "workforce bachelor's degree" which emphasizes the competencies demanded in a contemporary business environment over preparation for graduate school. Such degrees must still provide the solid general education core required by both SACS and Florida law and meet all the applicable baccalaureate criteria required by the Commission on Colleges.

The new workforce bachelor's degree represents the natural and logical next evolution of Florida's community colleges. Begun as "junior colleges" in 1933, Florida's community colleges have evolved continuously in response to community and employer needs. The mission of community colleges has expanded dramatically to include vocational and technical education, developmental education, community service, and continuing workforce education. The development of highly

successful associate in science degree programs directly responsive to employer needs provides a strong foundation for the new form of upper division preparation of interest to many employers. Florida's community colleges are well-positioned to add a limited number of new, high demand workforce bachelors' degrees to enhance their already significant impact on local and statewide economic development.

It must be clearly and emphatically noted that the Florida community colleges do not seek to become four-year institutions now or in the future. This position is affirmed by the statement of principle adopted in September, 1997 by the Florida Council of Community College Presidents which states (in part):

> *The Council of Presidents endorses the offering of baccalaureate degrees by community colleges in selected programs, as determined by local district boards of trustees and approved by the State Board of Community Colleges, based on documented local needs and demands, while avoiding unnecessary duplication of programs. It is the intention of the Council of Presidents that any modification of the mission of community colleges shall not affect the locally governed, open-access, community responsive, historical mission of Florida's community colleges, and that no community college may alter its mission entirely to that of a traditional four-year state college or university.*

The essential mission of community colleges has always been to respond to local educational and economic development needs. Employers indicate, however, that they are unable to find appropriately prepared bachelor's degree candidates in fields such as information technology and health services. While the traditional baccalaureate programs prepare students well for graduate study, some employers prefer candidates at the baccalaureate level with more practical than theoretical preparation. These employers want candidates who can demonstrate success in dealing with contemporary business problems and who can be productive, contributing members of their organization from the start. Accordingly, they seek more balance between the hard technical skills relevant to their business and essential "soft skills" - such as critical thinking, problem-solving communication and effective interpersonal relations - than is found in many traditional programs.

As new challenges require innovative responses, Florida's employers will be well served by an emerging new type of degree - the "workforce bachelor's degree." This new degree is designed to provide specific, practitioner-oriented preparation for immediate entry into technical professions. Florida's community colleges seek the authority to offer only a limited number of workforce bachelors' degrees in selected fields experiencing very high levels of employer demand and career opportunity for graduates.

The curricular content of the new workforce bachelors' degrees will be developed and maintained in close collaboration with employers. The content inventory and structure of the courses will remain, by design, very flexible to provide for rapid response to changing employer requirements and new developments in the field. The focus of the curriculum will be on relevance and immediate applicability to current and emergent needs of contemporary organizations. Course content will be less theoretical than the traditional bachelor's degree and will typically involve a significant work-based learning component.
Initial interest in authorizing Florida community colleges to develop and confer a limited number of

bachelors' degrees was expressed in 1998 by both the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (PEPC) and the Florida Legislature. The recently adopted PEPC Master Plan for Higher Education states:

> *The State Board of Community Colleges should develop a methodology for determining the need for and costs of offering limited baccalaureate programs at selected community colleges. These recommendations should be completed by December 31, 1998, for review by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission and submission to the legislature.*

Similarly, the 1998 Appropriations Bill (HB 4201) provides that,

> *The State Board of Community Colleges shall develop a methodology for determining the need for and costs of offering limited baccalaureate programs at selected community colleges. The recommendations should be completed by December 31, 1998, for review by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission and submission to the legislature. The State Board shall specifically consider the potential for the development of such programs at Miami-Dade Community College, St. Petersburg Junior College, Florida Community College at Jacksonville, and South Florida Community College.*

A committee of the Florida Council of Community College Presidents developed draft criteria for the approval of such baccalaureate programs at community colleges and a process by which approval could be obtained. The process would require the approval of all such programs by the local district board of trustees, the SBCC and PEPC. Colleges developing such programs would also be required to meet all applicable standards of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). The State Board of Community Colleges has reviewed and endorsed the following approach:

Proposal Criteria:

1. Need
   Demonstration of student and employer demand

   - $ Labor market information
   - $ Occupational forecast
   - $ Expressions of employer and relevant agency support
   - $ Evidence of student interests

2. Cost
   Specification of costs and demonstration of affordability

   - $ Personnel
   - $ Operations
   - $ Equipment
   - $ Facilities
   - $ Source of funding
   - $ Fiscal impact statement

3. Consultation/Collaboration

Report of consultation with state universities in region and plans for collaboration (if any)

4. Program
   Identification of intended outcomes and program design

5. Accreditation
   Evidence of ability to meet requirements

Approval Process:

Step I. Develop prospectus

- $ Address criteria 1, 2 and 4 in abbreviated form

Step II. Obtain submission approval from District Board

Step III. Obtain staff review and comment from SBCC

Step IV. Obtain staff review and comment from PEPC
(PEPC review will include consultation with colleges and universities in region)

Step V. Develop full proposal

- $ Address all criteria

Step VI. Obtain SBCC approval

- $ Approval of funding (if required)

Step VII. Obtain PEPC approval

In summary, the multiple approach suggested by PEPC is a good one. The SBCC is committed to working with the state's colleges and universities to provide the full range of postsecondary education opportunities. One component of this approach is that there may be times when community needs require the local community college to grant a limited number of baccalaureate programs. The SBCC endorses the concept of the limited workforce baccalaureate and the criteria/approval approach recommended by the Council of Presidents and the Strategic Plan Task Force.

Formal Articulation Policies

Several formal policies exist which protect the transfer of students from one institution to another. The foundation is the Statewide Course Numbering System, which requires that faculty committees, which assign numbers, review all courses. Courses that are 80% equivalent receive the same number. A student transferring from one institution to another is guaranteed that any course taken will be accepted and applied towards the degree if the receiving institution offers that same course. Adherence to this policy is particularly critical for students with disabilities where courses have been substituted while maintaining the integrity of required courses at the initial institution. The Statewide Course Numbering System contains all the college level courses and some vocational level courses.

A second formal policy protects the transfer of blocks of credit. According to the Articulation Agreement, any student who completed 36 hours of general education that met the core requirements of the original college cannot be required to take any additional courses to meet the general education requirement of a receiving institution. Further, any student who completes the Associate in Arts Degree, defined as the transfer degree, will be guaranteed admission into the SUS and will receive 60 credit hours towards their degree. The agreement, however, does not guarantee that students will be admitted to the university or program of their choice. Many programs in the SUS still remain limited access programs. And, while the 60 hours for an AA degree may transfer and apply towards the degree, if a student has taken the wrong courses or has changed majors, they will be required to complete all the necessary courses for the degree.

Beginning in 1996, two major initiatives (known as Time-to-Degree), have had an impact on articulation between the CCS and the SUS. The first was the move towards performance based budgeting and the second is the need to remove barriers that keep students from transferring to the SUS in an effective manner. These two forces have resulted in several policy changes related to articulation and academic programs since the completion of the last Strategic Plan:

1. All programs must have a standard length. University baccalaureate degree programs are required to be no more than 120 hours in length with some allowance for exceptions provided to the Board of Regents and the AA degree is required to be no more than 60 credit hours in length. The standard program hour lengths and excess hours policies were put in placed in order to provide some assurance that the performance incentives were being equitably awarded and to assure a level of competencies for articulation purposes.

2. The Legislature put in place an excess hours clause in the SUS that requires students to pay additional matriculation fees if they go beyond a certain number of credit hours. In the Community College System, incentives were provided for degrees that were awarded to students with fewer than 72 attempted credit hours. This policy was intended to improve cost effectiveness, require the students to assume some responsibility for completing their programs in a timely fashion, and prevent the expansion of the credit hours for degrees. The intent of the policies related to performance, incentives and excess hours was to shift the rewards to completions and outputs instead of seat time.

3. In keeping with the intent of removing barriers and reducing the number of excess hours, the Legislature required that all degree programs have the same common prerequisites statewide. This was an especially positive piece of legislation for the community college student who wished to prepare for possible transfer into more than one state university. It resulted in Common Prerequisites being agreed upon for over 600 university majors.

4. In 1998, as part of the Workforce Development process, the guarantee of statewide articulation was expanded to include AS to BS programs and the transfer of vocational credit into college credit programs.

These changes are having a significant impact on the CCS and on the interdependence of the various sectors. The 1998 legislation required that "...by Fall semester 1998, the articulation agreement must guarantee the statewide articulation of appropriate courses within associate in science degree programs to baccalaureate degree programs, according to standards established by the Articulation Coordinating Committee...Courses within an associate in applied science degree program may articulate into a baccalaureate degree program on an individual or block basis as authorized in local inter-institutional articulation agreements."

The expansion of the statewide agreement must take into consideration the SACS criteria that requires that any course intended to transfer to a senior institution be taught by faculty that have "completed at least 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline and hold at least a master's degree, or hold the minimum of a master's degree with a major in the teaching discipline."

A joint committee of SUS and CCS representatives, after reviewing the requirements of the law and accreditation requirements, have initially made two recommendations: 1) that the SBCC redefine the AS as a career and transfer degree and define the AAS as a career degree, 2) that the Office of Postsecondary Coordination establish a numbering system that differentiates courses that are taught by faculty with master's plus 18 hours in a teaching discipline from professional, occupational and technical courses taught by faculty with less than a master's plus 18 hours in a teaching discipline. Faculty discipline committees will be convened to develop AS to BA/BS Career Ladder articulation agreements.

Objective: The SBCC shall define the associate in applied science degree as a career degree that may articulate on an individual basis and redefine the associate in science degree as a career degree and a transfer degree. The SACS transfer requirements will be considered in the definition of the two associate degrees, so that articulation of the associate in science degree can be facilitated. Upon satisfactory completion of the work of the faculty discipline committees, the SBCC will seek to amend Rule 6A-14.030, F.A.C., to conform it to the recommended definitions.

The workforce development bill also mandated the articulation of vocational programs into college credit programs and the creation of the Applied Technology Diploma (ATD), which would articulate into the Associate in Science Degree

An ACC committee composed of representatives from the vocational sector and the community college sector are developing an agreement that would provide for the career ladder articulation. SACS faculty criteria also are a consideration in their deliberations, because SACS requires that

faculty members teaching in an associate program that does not transfer have a minimum of an associate degree. Vocational clock hour programs do not have the same requirement. Consequently, if a program, such as the ATD is to transfer on a one-to-one basis, then the faculty qualifications must be comparable. The school district vocational centers are accredited by the Council on Occupational Education, which has different faculty criteria. While they have agreed to increase their faculty qualifications, the difficulty is establishing a system to validate the qualifications that will be acceptable to SACS.

Objective: The DCC and the Division of Workforce Development will work towards an accepted validation process that facilitates the transfer of students without jeopardizing the accreditation standing of any institution, whether they be SACS or COE accredited.

Independent Colleges

In November, 1992, a landmark event took place with the signing of an Articulation Agreement between the State Board of Community Colleges and the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF). The intent of the Agreement was to establish "an effective and orderly transfer process for students entering a state community college, completing an associate in arts degree, and transferring to an independent college or university." Under the Agreement, community college students holding an associate in arts degree are guaranteed junior standing, recognition of the general education core, and the application of a minimum of 60 credit hours toward the baccalaureate degree. The Agreement establishes an articulation committee composed of representatives from Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida and from the Community College System. The Articulation Committee has the following responsibilities:

1. to review instances of student transfer and admissions difficulties and recommend appropriate solutions;

2. to recommend the resolution of issues and policies which will improve articulation between the institutions; and,

3. to conduct continuing reviews of the provisions of the Articulation Agreement.

Objective: The DCC and ICUF will continue to work together to ensure their articulation agreement meets the needs of students transferring from one sector to the other.

In addition to the overall articulation agreement, individual colleges have established a number of formal 2+2 on-campus arrangements bringing BA access to their service areas, e.g., St. Leo College is offering the BA degree in Palatka on the campus of St. Johns River Community College. Also, the independent colleges have responded positively to this new partnership with an impressive array of financial aid opportunities targeted at community college graduates.

Statewide Student Advising System
Florida Academic Counseling and Tracking for Students (FACTS)

The emphasis on articulation, career ladders, and excess hours, requires that degree audit advising systems, be accurate, timely, accessible and useful for students and faculty. The State has committed to the development of a statewide system that will provide students access to their transcript and transfer information via the Internet. The design for the system includes the development of other components including admission, registration, fee payments and financial aid, all with the intent of making information available to both on-campus students and distance learners. Consideration must be given towards making the information provided to students with disabilities as accessible as the information provided to other students.

It is important, as PEPC has stated in the Master Plan, that the System add value to what currently exists. In order to do this, each institution must make a commitment to dedicate staff to the development of the infrastructure and applications necessary to connect to the system.

The SBCC and the SUS have been working to develop a plan and a budget for a statewide student advising system that will allow expansion into components including admissions, registration, financial aid, fee payment, and career advisement.

Development, coordination and on-going operation of this statewide system and the related infrastructure will require significant support. The Florida Center for Advising and Academic Support (FCAAS) has been established at the University of South Florida to provide this support.

The mission of the Center is to provide current and prospective students with the information necessary for academic planning through implementation of a single statewide computer-assisted advising system. The system will include degree program availability, degree tracking, degree shopping, transcript display, and access to local institutional graduation audits. The system is intended to provide online support services for students taking distance learning and traditional programs and courses. The system will be flexible enough to allow expansion for other functions such as admission applications, financial aid, registration, career advisement, and fee payments. It will combine and adapt the systems of the SUS and Community Colleges System to provide a workable solution for students enrolled in public universities and community colleges. The success of the system will be determined when a student with a course history can successfully degree shop at any community college or state university using this system. A major function of FACTS will be to allow high school counselors access to the various components via the Internet thereby enhancing the ability to produce "college ready" high school graduates.

Objective: The SBCC will continue to support the development of the Statewide Student Advising System and each community college will commit to supporting the implementation of the system on their campus with appropriate adaptations for students with physical impairments.

Student Financial Assistance

In the Spring of 1997, the State Board of Community Colleges contracted for a Level I Program Review of student financial aid. In conducting this review, three major issues came into focus. These included the inadequacy of state need-based programs, the growing need for financial aid availability for part-time students, and the imbalance between need-based and merit-based programs.

State Need-Based Aid Programs

As stated in the PEPC report entitled *How Floridians Pay for College*, the policy of the State of Florida (S.240.105(1), F.S.) is committed to enabling students of all ages, backgrounds and levels of income to participate in postsecondary education. Section 240.437(2)(a), F.S., explains that the policy of the state financial aid programs should be based primarily on financial need. However, to date a majority of the funds for state financial aid programs goes to merit based programs such as Bright Futures.

Providing sufficient financial assistance continues to be a primary factor in ensuring access to higher education in Florida. Nowhere is this issue more pronounced than in Florida's twenty-eight community colleges, which enroll the greatest numbers of students with the lowest median incomes. In addition, both federal and state financial aid programs have failed to keep pace with rising costs. Florida demographics reflect a growing number of economically-disadvantaged students needing to prepare themselves for the changing workforce.

The primary issue facing the community colleges in Florida is the lack of sufficient need-based financial aid funds to assist the students who most need such assistance. Family income, characteristics of students and families, and the cost of education are factors that determine whether students can afford, and thus attend, college. Community colleges enroll more students who possess characteristics that cause them to face greater financial challenges than other students. The State's emphasis on funding students with academic merit at the expense of students with financial need has resulted in a severe shortage of financial aid available for students with the greatest financial need.

Federal Pell Grants are intended for the above referenced students. Over 100,000 Florida students who receive Pell Grants do not qualify for an FSAG award. The majority of these students attend a community college. In fact, there were 5.2 times more Pell Grant recipients than FSAG recipients at community colleges in 1995-96, indicating again that funding is not available for some of the most appropriate students.

Objective: The FSAG program will receive, at a minimum, additional funding to ensure that all students eligible for Pell Grants will also receive state need-based support.

State Aid for Part-time Students

In 1995-96, 51% of the dependent students who applied for need-based financial assistance enrolled as less than full-time students. Less than one-third of the independent students attended full-time. Current state program regulations require students to be enrolled full-time in order to be eligible for state need-based grant programs. Thus the majority of community college students are automatically denied access to state need-based grant programs. The demand for part-time enrollment will continue

to increase. Many community college students are financially responsible for both themselves and a family, and they cannot afford to enroll for as many courses as they would like to take. During the 1997 Legislative Session, legislation was passed which would enable half-time and three-quarter time students to become eligible to receive a Florida Bright Futures Scholarship. This represents a significant change in state policy.

Funds for the FSAG program should be used to extend eligibility to part-time students. The community colleges serve students that enroll as full-time to be eligible for FSAG and then are not able to complete all their hours, which affects their eligibility for the following year. If they were eligible for part-time awards, they could maintain their eligibility from year-to-year, which would help with completion rates. There could be a cost savings to the state because students would be attempting only the hours they need (less excess hours). More students could be served and served better if the part-time allowance was permitted. Many students who would be financially eligible under the current program are turned down each semester because of their part-time status.

With the passage of House Bill 4259 by the 1998 Legislature, the distribution of funds for the FSAG program will be determined at the institutional level starting in July 1999. The Florida Council of Student Financial Aid Advisors is charged with developing a formula to distribute an appropriation to each institution so the colleges can make awards to students.

Objective: Since over 60% of community college students enroll as part-time students and other assistance programs allow part-time students to participate, state need-based programs should be made available to part-time students. In addition, community colleges should review their total available funds for financial aid (federal, state, and local) and develop a plan for distributing their merit and need-based aid to their student population.

Increased Emphasis on Merit Scholarships

As competition for limited state funds increases, the debate on the appropriate balance between need-based grants and merit scholarships continues to be a focal point of attention for the Legislature, despite a clearly defined State priority delineated in Section 240.437(2), Florida Statutes. Based on recent state appropriations, there has been a shift in state policy from need-based programs to merit-based programs despite recommendations to the contrary. For several years the Council of Student Financial Aid Advisors and PEPC have recommended that need-based programs be given the highest priority for legislative appropriations.

The cost of Bright Futures has risen from $75 million the first year to $120 million the second. The program costs are likely to increase to over $200 million by the year 2000. Because Bright Futures is linked to the tuition and fees of the institutions, any increase will require more money to fund the scholarship program. The cost of this program is likely to reach extreme proportions as the number of students entering the postsecondary systems increases.

Based upon the current criteria, most of the entering freshmen in the State University System will qualify for one of the Bright Futures Scholarships. Members of the Legislature and the Business/Higher Education Partnership have suggested that the eligibility requirements be raised above the current 3.0 GPA and 970 SAT requirement. In addition, it has also been suggested that a means test be added as an eligibility requirement for the Florida Merit Scholarship (middle tier).

There is also the issue of the Federal HOPE tax credit and whether or not state money should be used to cover students' tuition and fees when the federal government is willing to provide a tax credit for the same thing. Students are not eligible for the tax credit if their tuition and fees are covered by other grant aid. A concern arises as to whether or not the state is utilizing the scholarship's funds in the best way possible. Representatives of the SUS, the CCS, ICUF, and the Business/Higher Education Partnership are currently developing recommendations for consideration by the 1999 Legislature that would enhance Bright Futures.

Objective: The CCS supports the review of the Bright Futures Scholarship Program and merit based aid. Recommendations from the joint review group should be acted on by the SBCC prior to the 1999 Legislative Session.

Community Service/Service-Learning in Community Colleges

Over the years, policy makers and educators have put a greater emphasis on the role of community service within the educational process. In addition, a national and state emphasis has been placed on the importance of community service and the value of service-learning in the academic environment. Mr. Steve Uhlfelder, past chair of the BOR, recently wrote in the Tallahassee Democrat: "We should be graduating students who are interested in not only what they can contribute to their professions but also what they can contribute to their fellow citizens.... The local and state partnerships universities create and the service-learning courses they offer are important factors to be considered when evaluating an institution of higher learning." Many states have added participation in community service projects as a requirement for high school graduation or scholarships. For example, Florida high school graduates in 1999 will need to complete a program of 75 hours of community service to be eligible for the Bright Futures Scholarship. Some institutions require students to complete a minimum number of service hours if they have received certain types of financial aid or scholarships.

Each community college has a unique perspective on the role it plays in the areas of community service, volunteerism and service-learning. Some colleges have nationally recognized centers and programs while other institutions simply have one or two campus volunteer programs a year. Most of the community colleges are in the middle of the two extremes and offer a variety of service-learning courses, college sponsored programs and student organization sponsored activities. Some institutions specifically address service-learning in their mission statement.

Many of the colleges are encouraging professors to add service-learning components to some of the required courses at their institutions. Over half of the community colleges have courses with a service-learning component, require service as part of a course, or allow students to receive extra credit for service. Colleges should encourage the use of service-learning environments that increase students' sensitivity and knowledge of the needs of individuals with disabilities and varying racial and national origins. Service-learning has the potential to impact students in several ways. Some of the colleges have reported that students show an increased sense of personal achievement, enhanced self-confidence, increased ability to work independently, and improvement with communication and time management skills. Some students even report that participation in service-learning has increased their interest in course work while helping them persist in college.

Several opportunities exist at the colleges for combining student community service opportunities and student financial aid. Many institutions honor their students with awards and scholarships for their active participation in community service. At least half of the institutions participate in the America Reads Program, the College Work Study Program, or the Florida Work Experience Program which provides students with paid opportunities to work in the community or local schools. Specific examples of linking local financial aid funds with community service needs include:

1. Student Ambassadors - Some colleges provide a grant from financial aid fee revenues to students willing to assist the college during their senior year of high school. Ambassadors serve as peer counselors and a point of contact in the high school to provide college information, requirements, referrals, dual enrollment details, etc.;

2. Community Service Scholarships - Some colleges allot a number of scholarships funded from the financial aid fee to top high school students willing to also provide a number of community service hours to the college or the community. Such programs are not viewed as student employment opportunities, but rather a structure to assure students find volunteer opportunities and receive any necessary training.

Objective: Community colleges are encouraged to incorporate the provisions of community service opportunities, volunteer opportunities in social service agencies and public schools, as well as service-learning curriculum components into both their institutional goals and their institutional effectiveness plans. Consideration will be given by the colleges to linking community service hours to some of their local scholarship programs.

Objective: The Council on Instructional Affairs and the Council of Student Affairs are encouraged to develop staff in-service training opportunities for their members that will allow further sharing of model programs in community service and service-learning throughout the colleges.

Technology Challenge

In "The Connected Learning Community" published by Microsoft in Higher Education, Bill Gates states:

> The 21st Century Campus has no boundaries. Students learn in the classroom, in dorm rooms and at their kitchen table at home. A student at a university in Chicago receives instruction from a professor in South Africa. Faculty advises students via e-mail unrestricted by office hours. Academic researchers have information from around the world at their fingertips. Robust software and PC networks manage tasks such as student registration and financial aid, making them more user-friendly and efficient.

James L. Morrison, Microsoft Scholar and Professor of Educational Leadership, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill states in the same publication:

> Our students are entering a world in which 60 percent of the jobs will require technological competence - a world in which they must continue to update their occupational and technological skills to be successful.

Furthermore, it notes that entering college freshmen in 1998 will change jobs more than seven times in their lifetimes, often needing to return to school for advanced training or re-education. In view of the increasing need for technology skills in a growing number of occupations, the SBCC believes students should have access to the tools necessary to work in these occupations.

Objective: All students will have computer access at home or in special on-campus labs. The colleges will explore leasing options as part of their efforts to keep all PC's updated and readily available to students.

CCLA/LINCC

The State of Florida and the Florida Community College System have received notable national recognition and praise for the establishment and operation of the College Center for Library Automation (CCLA)/Library Information Network for Community Colleges (LINCC) system. The original system chosen nine years ago has been flexible enough to adapt to Internet connectivity and to place Florida in a leadership role in library support of distance education. However, the core system now requires replacement to enable the elimination of "dumb terminals" from the statewide system and to expand PC access for students and faculty. In addition, moving to a "client server" computer architecture will enable the use of new and more productive software capability in library management functionality. This system replacement will also allow more efficient methods to address growing student use of the system and extension of the system to remote teaching centers and off-campus teaching sites.

The statewide Library Information Network for Community Colleges connects the libraries of all twenty-eight community colleges as a single online resource sharing system and utilizes the Florida Information Resources Network (FIRN) as its base telecommunications medium. LINCC provides students with access to institutional and statewide community college library holdings, interconnection to the SUS Library User Information Service (LUIS) system, the Library Information on Line (LION) system, part of the State Library of Florida, as well as many other library and information resources through Internet based library products and services. Library staffs are also provided with online library management functions to increase productivity and efficiency of library operations. The College Center for Library Automation (CCLA) was authorized by the Florida Legislature in 1989 and subsequently formed by the Division of Community Colleges (DCC) to implement a centralized automated library system for Florida's twenty-eight community colleges.

Providing licensed access to electronic intellectual property is beyond the scope of local institutional funding and has proven more cost efficient to approach on a statewide scale in cooperative purchasing with the State University System. The project has gained national attention for Florida leadership in providing and supporting broad access to print and electronic library materials and services regardless of student location.

Online library databases are also provided for student and faculty use. Pilot efforts in the two-year Distance Learning Library Initiative program proved that these resources are highly used by all students both on and off campus. Combined purchasing and contracting efforts between the State Board of Community Colleges and the Board of Regents have placed the State in an advantageous negotiating position in the national marketplace and a firm source of funding is needed to continue this advantage.

Objective: The CCS will continue to place a high priority on the statewide purchase and licensing of on-line databases and related instructional materials and equipment through the expansion of the CCLA and other initiatives.

Distance Learning

In March 1997, the SBCC approved its Out-of-District Distance Learning Policy. This policy ameliorates the traditional service area boundaries found in statute by providing an approval process for colleges to deliver distance learning courses and programs statewide and/or regionally. Both Associate in Science degree programs and online college credit courses have been approved for statewide delivery.

The State Board of Community Colleges' Out-of-District Distance Learning policy specifically states that prior to a college receiving approval to deliver a distance learning course/program statewide, the institution must document two provisions: (1) adequate student support services and (2) financial agreement. To determine if the provision of "adequate student support services" has been met, colleges must certify compliance with the Southern Regional Education Board's (SREB) Principles of Good Practice for Distance Learning. Contained within this document is a checklist of items that each institution must sign off with regards to student and academic support services.

As a result of this approval process, once a college has received SBCC approval to offer a distance learning course/program statewide, the college can then elect to advance their distance learning course/program to the SREB's Electronic Campus.

Continuing with the goal of "easing the geographic service boundaries for the technological delivery of educational courses and programs," the SBCC has further advocated that electronically originated instruction shall be exempt from Section 240.311, F.S. During the 1998 Legislative Session, legislation was passed which stated:

> For purposes of this subparagraph of statute, electronically originated instruction, to include satellite, broadcast, and Internet delivered instruction, shall be exempt. Exemption is permitted only when the community college's intent is to offer the instruction for students residing within the community college's home district and markets only to students residing within the community college's home district. If a community college's intent is to market the electronically originated instruction outside its home district and thus recruit students outside its home district, the community college must receive the approval of the State Board of Community Colleges. The State Board of Community Colleges shall have authority to review any electronically originated instruction for compliance with this section of statute.

The intent of this legislation is to facilitate a student's enrollment in any distance learning course offered by a Florida community college, when such a student elects to access such a course. Therefore, the Community College System has, through policy implementation, encouraged student access to instructional courses and programs using distance learning technologies. However, the SBCC believes it is in the best interest of its System to be involved in the approval process when a college intends to actively recruit students statewide. This is primarily attributable to the issue of ensuring adequate student support services.

The Florida Community College Distance Learning Consortium (FCCDLC) has built a Community College Distance Learning Catalog. This catalog is a multi-criterion, searchable database of all distance learning courses currently offered by all Florida community colleges. Any student, with access to the Internet, can search the catalog. Once a student has located a course of interest, clicking on the college offering the course will link the student to that institution and allow them to enroll.

Having built such a catalog, the opportunity for students to access distance learning courses from multiple institutions clearly exists. Colleges have recognized that allowing students to access distance learning courses from other institutions will help that student progress through his/her degree program. A current SACS requirement states that at least 25% of the courses counted toward the completion of a degree must be awarded by the degree granting institution. For an Associate in Arts degree, this would equate to 15 credit hours. While adhering to this requirement, colleges can encourage students, through the electronic catalog, to access distance learning courses that meet their needs and help them toward their degree completion. Once a student completes a program, the college will grant the appropriate degree or certificate.

The existing CCS Electronic Catalog would be enhanced by the addition of the electronic offerings at Florida's ten state universities, course offerings in professional and staff development, adult education and dual enrollment. Such a combined student services tool should include links to the home page and the information available at each of the ten universities. Consideration should be given by the CCS and the SUS to shifting the combined catalog to the FACTS Center at USF for operational purposes. Such an approach will assure that the Electronic Catalog, the Electronic Student Advising System, and the Distance Learning Library Initiative activities are all housed and supported in a coordinated manner.

The three initiatives discussed above

- Out-of-District Distance Learning Policy
- Exemption of electronically originated instruction from Section 240.311, F.S., and
- Electronic Catalog

have "opened the doors" for the statewide delivery of distance learning instruction. All are based upon collaboration among all twenty-eight community colleges. A design team consisting of representatives from both the CCS and the SUS has recently explored the possibility of a combined CCS/SUS virtual institution that would provide a central framework for programs ranging from postsecondary certificates to graduate education degrees. The final report of the Design Team (Appendix D) has been approved by both the BOR and the SBCC. The proposed virtual institution will significantly enhance the distance learning "access" component as recommended by PEPC , the SBCC, and the BOR. The virtual college will also assist all 28 colleges in providing specialized coursework that is required as common prerequisites for some specialized majors in the SUS.

Florida's community colleges have submitted a proposal to SACS for a statewide distance learning substantive accreditation site visit for all twenty-eight community colleges. One provision that will need to be addressed, from a statewide perspective, is the issue of student support services. SACS currently requires that distant learners must have student services equivalent to those on the primary campus and the statewide self-study will need to verify that this criteria element is indeed met.

Florida is working collaboratively with the State University System on the deployment of a statewide electronic student advising system (FACTS). (See Section on Access for additional information.) Florida's community colleges are also working with the British Open University in the development of a "model learning resource center" patterned after their very successful distributed learning/resource center.

Florida's community colleges have already demonstrated a commitment to the statewide purchase and licensing of instructional material through the statewide licensing and distribution of telecourses. Telecourse licenses are issued by the term, year, and sometimes, multiple years. The longer the licensing period, the lower the cost becomes per student. Florida's community colleges have recognized the value of telecourses for more than 20 years through a legislative appropriation for their purchase.

Florida's community colleges have also partnered with the State University System and Florida's public libraries in the implementation of the Distance Learning Library Initiative. Through this initiative, a contract with Online Computer Library Center and its FirstSearch electronic databases and Online Britannica was negotiated. These resources are available to students enrolled in all twenty-eight community colleges.

The Community College Electronic Catalog can identify those distance learning courses currently offered by a Florida community college. Perhaps what is more important, is the ability to identify the types of distance learning courses needed. Florida's community colleges can now target these needed distance learning courses, in particular those in high demand and high cost areas, for licensing and/or co-development.

Any distance learning course co-developed with a public/private entity will be made available to any Florida public community college at no cost. Additionally, these co-developed courses will be marketed for licensing outside the state with a certain percentage of the licensing fee coming back into the CCS. This will provide a revenue stream for further course and program co-development opportunities.

The Community College System suggests that there are four major components needed to successfully build a functional technology infrastructure.

1. Affordable - Colleges need appropriate bandwidth to support all technological applications: to include, but not limited to, data, administration, and instruction. Colleges need to be able to afford the cost of the bandwidth; potentially such a charge should be a fixed subscriber rate with no additional time, distance, or usage charges.

2. Telecommunications Equipment (regional and institutional) - Colleges need to be able to use the bandwidth by having their area networks established which would include, but not be limited to, servers, routers, mainframe upgrades, computer, etc.

3. Technical Support and Training - Colleges need technical staff, capable of supporting all equipment and networking functions, and programmers, capable of modifying and maintaining operating software.

4. Instructional Content/Program Priorities - Colleges need to acquire, either through licensing or co-developing arrangements, needed distance learning programs and needed student and academic support services.

Objective: The CCS will work closely with the SUS and independent colleges to implement the virtual college recommendations contained in the Design Team's final report (Appendix D).

Objective: In order to ensure the necessary funds are available, the CCS will include in its Legislative budget request funds to reward faculty members who successfully convert or adapt their course materials for effective electronic delivery.

Objective: The CCS will continue to encourage innovative procurement plans and replacement policies for advanced telecommunications and computer technologies and other critical equipment needs. The System will recommend in its budget requests the funding of technology as an ongoing expense.

Performance Challenge

The CCS was the first sector of higher education to face the challenge of performance based funding. While measures had been previously developed in response to a 1991 accountability requirement, the tie between funding and performance did not occur until 1994. The Performance Based Budgeting (PBB) process was seen as a way of focusing government on results with incentives that would be available to hold agencies accountable. PBB for the CCS has been developed as an incentive process with the monies involved set at approximately two percent of the total appropriations and coming from new monies, not base funding.

The PBB measures have focused on awards and the students who receive them. Money has been given for the number of awards, the number of students who were members of special populations such as the disabled, and the number of students completing their programs in a timely manner.

Even though the amount of money has been relatively small, the process has resulted in improved performance. The number of degrees awarded in 1992-93 was 31,235. By 1997-98, this number had increased to 37,707 or a gain of 20.7%. The number of degrees was increasing at the same time the number of FTE's was declining. In 1992-93, the system-wide total FTE was 194,482. By 1997-98, that number had decreased to 184,180 or a decline of 5.3%. The increase in degrees is even more remarkable when one considers the decline in college credit FTE was almost 11%.

Major objectives of a community college degree are to provide the individuals completing the program with both an improved sense of self-worth that translates into a positive way of interacting in society and a set of competencies that translate into needed workforce skills.

The value of these degrees is seen in the increased earning and other positive societal outcomes for persons with the awards versus those without them. The Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) conducts annual follow-up studies on students earning different types of awards. The estimated initial annual earning of 1995-96 AS degree recipients working full-time was $28,844. Persons with certificates earned between $21,000 and $25,000, while high school graduates earned only $13,461.

A major reason for the high earnings is the match between the programs being offered at community colleges and the jobs available in the State. FETPIP also produced a report comparing the community college programs producing the most completers to the occupations most needed in the State as determined by the wages earned in the fourth quarter of 1995. Thirty percent of the 1994-95 PSAV completers were from programs that were in the top 25 average 1995 fourth quarter full-time earnings. Over half of the AS degree students (53.5%) and almost all of the college credit certificates were in this category (99.2%). In contrast, less than ten percent (8.2%) of the bachelor degrees were in the top twenty-five earning occupations. This type of analysis was not conducted on AA degree holders since the major outcome of the AA degree is transfer to the SUS (62% in the first year and 75% over a multi-year tracking period).

Community college degree holders also have more positive social outcomes. They are only about one-half as likely to be on welfare or under the supervision of the Department of Corrections as high school graduates. Thus both the individual and the State benefit from this level of educational attainment.

Objective: The CCS will continue to provide programs that match the workforce needs of the State thereby ensuring that individuals earning degrees are able to successfully find employment and/or continue their education.

Honors Programs

If Florida's community colleges are to remain the primary access point for students seeking a BA degree, it is essential that they provide a truly comprehensive array of programs. More than 3,800 students in twenty-two institutions are participating in honors programs. These programs were established to provide challenging courses for motivated and talented community college students. They attract traditional and non-traditional, full-time and part-time students. Proportionately more women than men are enrolled in honors courses. Based on data reported by the colleges, over twenty-five (25%) of the honors program participants are minority students. Fifty-eight (58%) percent of honors program participants receive scholarships.

Students admitted to honors programs in Florida's community colleges typically are required to have a high school GPA of 3.5 or higher on a 4 point scale, and ACT/SAT test scores comparable to those of students admitted to the State University System. Of the eleven community colleges reporting SAT standards for admission to the honors program, seven required an SAT score of 1100 or higher, or an ACT score of 25 or higher for admission to honors programs. For students to continue to participate in honors courses after they enter college, they must maintain a GPA of at least 3.0; more than half of the colleges require that students maintain a GPA of 3.2 or higher to remain in the honors program.

Courses typically required for participation in the honors program are humanities, liberal arts, English literature, social science, and natural science courses. Only two colleges require a foreign language, and only four require mathematics courses for students participating in the honors program. Two colleges require participation in special honors program seminars. Several colleges use an annual study topic as a focal point of their honors program.

As greater emphasis is placed on skills for the 21st century, computational, technological, and foreign language skills are increasingly the focus of educators, employers, legislators, and students. Broadening the scope of honors program to reflect the sciences and technologically related programs makes sense for several reasons. First, it may attract more males who have not participated in the past to honors programs. Second, it would broaden access for women and ethnic minority groups who have traditionally been under represented in these categories. Third, it would bring increased emphasis to areas where there are shortages of qualified people who have the necessary technical knowledge to help the nation remain globally competitive. Lastly, such an emphasis could potentially attract employer partnerships that benefit colleges, employers, and communities.

As the State discusses the percentage of prior year high school graduates entering community colleges and universities, it is critical that such discussions not result in a student mix that does not represent the full array of skills possessed by graduating high school seniors. Effective honors programs are an incentive to top students who desire to work in the community while in college but who also desire very challenging course work.

Objective: The Council on Instructional Affairs should initiate a discussion with the members of the Florida Collegiate Honors Council and develop any needed policy recommendations that would enhance honors programs. In addition, the two groups should develop a cooperative approach that assures that information on the honors programs in Florida's community colleges is effectively shared among the colleges.

Workforce Challenge

A workforce crisis looms over Florida and the nation. According to the Council on Competitiveness May 1998 report to Congress, *Winning the Skills Race:*

- X 60% of corporate CEOs polled in 1997 singled out the skills shortage as the number one barrier to growth.
- X An entire generation of skilled workers must be replaced by 2005.
- X The skills crunch is structural, stemming from changes in workplace technology, demographic trends, shortfalls in K-12 education, and intense global competition.
- X The current period of economic growth provides a window of opportunity to tackle the challenge that would not exist under a recession.
- X Entrepreneurial community colleges have emerged as a powerful factor in workforce and community and economic development.

Nowhere is there a more entrepreneurial community college system than in Florida. That is especially important since in Florida, the skills crisis takes on special character:

- X The majority of Florida's growth jobs require postsecondary education below the baccalaureate level.

- X The existing workforce has a high percentage of low skilled workers, making the skills crisis particularly acute in Florida.

- X Education levels in the State of Florida rank near the bottom of the nation in high school graduation rates and college continuation rates. Only 29% of 19-year olds are enrolled in college compared with 40% nationally.

- X Work to improve the quality of K-12 students is underway, but its impact will be felt slowly over a number of years, and it will not solve the problems of the existing

- X workforce which is key to maintaining Florida's national and international competitiveness.

- X According to the December 1997 report of the Florida Business/Higher Education Partnership,

    - X state revenues are limited, and the costs of undergraduate education must be controlled for students with associate and baccalaureate degree goals;

    - X community colleges have increased degree production steadily over a period of six years;

    - X (the Partnership) reaffirms (its) belief in the crucial connection between higher education and Florida's economic development prospects; and,

    - X the State needs both an increase in bachelor degree production and substantial increase in short-term training and two-year occupational programs that are the community colleges' specialty.

Workforce Development

Issues related to workforce development have changed dramatically in the past decade. Initially the major concerns related to "turf" - the protection of turf, controlling duplication, discouraging competition and encouraging cooperation. The State Board addressed issues that related to helping the community colleges maintain their positions. Performance was beginning to be addressed by the Legislature and the State Board, but in terms of standards for continuation, not in terms of funding.

A decade ago, vocational programs (not to include adult and continuing education programs) were to meet the performance standard of placing 70% of a program's graduates at least one year out of a three year period. Theoretically, programs were no longer eligible for funding if this standard was missed. However, there was not a penalty for not meeting the 70% and no community college lost funding.

In the past five years, funding for workforce programs has become more and more dependent upon performance. Perhaps because these programs are so specific in their purpose, to train students for

specific occupations, evaluating their success has become a target for accountability efforts. During the 1997 and 1998 legislative sessions, workforce development funding based on performance became one of the higher priority pieces of legislation for both chambers. The result, which is still to be implemented, is a funding system that merges funding for adult education, vocational credit education, and degree/college credit education into one system. Both school districts and colleges will earn funds from this system, and will have 15% of their prior year funding "at risk" based on their performance.

This performance system is designed to reward institutions that offer programs that meet the needs of the State. About five years ago, the SBCC, in cooperation with the Department of Education, began encouraging institutions to offer the types of programs that were more directly related to local needs. The Occupational Forecasting Process was created to identify the programs that meet local or community and statewide needs. A list of statewide job openings by businesses would be identified with the programs that address those needs. Then local communities would adjust the list accommodating for their local needs. Thus, there was a forecast of the needs for every region in the state to compare to what an institution offers. At first about 70% of the community college programs were on the Occupational Forecasting list. Now that percentage is up to nearly 88% and the percentage is even greater of programs on the statewide list. Some institutions have 100% of their programs on the Occupational Forecasting List.

Around the same time as the Occupational Forecasting Process started, the first performance funding system, Performance Based Incentive Funding (PBIF), was started. The original design was intended to be similar to that adopted by the Legislature in 1998. The needed programs would be identified and institutions would be rewarded for placing students out of those programs. In trying to implement this, however, the Legislature began the implementation using federal funds. However, with federal funds came the requirement to target the performance of the population that the federal money served, the economically disadvantaged. While this was not the original intent, the federal funds, in combination with a small pot of state money, did allow for the rewarding of institutions for performance in those programs on the Occupational Forecasting List. The colleges have experienced great success under this program, having earned millions of dollars not available to them previously. The number of completions, placements and enrollments in the targeted programs and of targeted students has increased dramatically. This effort has been very successful in helping institutions target their efforts. One of the reasons for this success is the financial incentive, which gives the institutions the reason for changing programs. Consequently, the community colleges are offering the programs that they should be offering.

One issue that the community colleges continue to struggle with, however, in the old performance system and the new, is program completions. Students more often than not will take several courses, and leave the institution to obtain employment that uses the skills obtained in the courses. In the past, these students have been called "leavers with marketable skills." While considered a "success" by the colleges, the notion of a student "leaving" has been hard to sell as a success to the public. This issue was addressed in SB 1688 with the creation of Occupational Completion Points or OCP's. An OCP is reached when a person completes the courses that contain a set of marketable skills, but do not represent a full certificate or degree. Someone who has achieved those skills and can go to work will have earned performance credit for the institution. Legislation to create OCP's has been passed and is now being implemented. However, implementation has been strictly tailored to increasing the "fundable" performance of the institutions. A continuing issue for the system will be reassessing the completion points to insure that the competencies included are those needed for an

occupation.
The Florida Legislature, as mentioned earlier, focused on workforce issues during the past two (2) sessions. Those issues included adult education, occupational education, and continuing education. Impetus for much of this discussion came from the "level playing field" issue which the CCS initiated. The issue came from the desire to allow community colleges to offer adult vocational programs and adult education programs if needed in their community, without asking permission of the school districts.

The Legislature agreed to the concept, but took it a step further. The Legislature used the opportunity to create a funding system that encouraged this cooperation, and at the same time funded all providers in the same way. The 1997 legislation, SB 1688, created a single funding system for both the community colleges and the school districts, and opened up competition. This legislation included some aspects that concerned the colleges and the school districts, especially in creating a system that seemed too complex to drive the intended behavior.

The 1998 Legislature, with input from a year long task force, amended the funding formula to concentrate on simple performances. According to the 1998 legislation, an institution will earn its workforce funds based on eighty-five percent (85%) of the prior year's allocation, plus any additional funds (plus or minus the remaining 15%) based on performance, plus any incentive funds available. The 1998 Legislature also clarified that the policy control for occupation programs was not changing due to the creation of this new fund, and stated that the funds for the AS degree programs will come to the DCC, which will then distribute them to the colleges.

These pieces of legislation will probably make an impact in terms of local governance issues, as well. School districts that offer adult programs may find themselves more willing to shift those programs to the colleges because of the following:

1. The same fees will now be charged for the same level on instruction at both the school districts and the community colleges.

2. The school districts can no longer use local millage to support postsecondary adult, adult, or any workforce education programs. These programs have to be supported out of state funds or local fees.

3. One hundred percent (100%) of funds must stay with the institution where they were earned. As a result, vocational centers can no longer generate funds to be used elsewhere in the school district.

In addition to the performance issues relating to workforce programs, the CCS has been partially successful in the funding of "start up" costs and operating costs of those programs that the community colleges know that they want to offer and have demonstrated the need to offer. The CCS created a source of funds, the "capitalization incentive grant", for this purpose. After several successful years, however, the 1998 legislation on workforce education moved this program to PEPC and expanded the participants to the school districts. While competition is appropriate, it is critical to the ability of the colleges to create programs that these funds be maintained.

In terms of the future, or where we want to go, there are five areas that should be stressed by the colleges and the SBCC:

1. More involvement of the business community in this system is needed. A sense of ownership of the college system needs to be targeted. The employers in this state depend on the system to provide their trained employees, and the colleges need to depend on those employers to insure that the programs are designed and supported appropriately. A closer partnership with the business community will lead to greater success of both the colleges and the employers.

2. More training for small businesses, particularly those owned by women and minorities, needs to be explored. The upgrading of skills for these citizens will enhance services that they provide to the colleges and to other entities in the State. Training will further help these enterprises to become more competitive in their bids for community college and other contracts.

3. The process of Occupational Forecasting should be improved by including data at the national level and from other states. While the Occupational Forecasting process is a success, and a national model, improvement is always possible. The inclusion of national data, and identification of occupations emerging in other states, will help move the process into more of a "forecasting" role than a "reporting" role.

4. The use of distance learning for the provision of workforce instruction needs to be expanded. With the changing nature of the workforce, and the growing need of employers for "just in time education," the use of new technologies to reach students is extremely critical. Historically, though the history is short, distance learning is thought of as a tool to offer more traditional college courses. Expansion to new areas must be a high priority.

5. The structure of workforce certificates and degrees need to be continually re-examined to insure relevance to the workplace. Unless workforce programs are constantly revitalized, they run the risk of becoming outdated. Performance measures and funding will support this review, but the system needs to develop the ability to evaluate beyond those measures.

In addition, attention needs to be focused on adult education and continuing education. With adult education, there is a recurring issue regarding the provision of instruction for disabled adults. Adult education must be also linked to workforce readiness and to remedial education. Adult education has suffered from a lack of accountability and must be a higher priority. Performance funding has the potential for improving adult education and should be used for that purpose.

Under continuing education, the business community needs the support of the colleges. This support is needed not only for people who are already employed, but also for short term training needed for expansion. Discussion of a dedicated source of funding for "upgrade" training has taken place, and should be a priority for the system.

Objective: The system will develop closer partnerships with the business community, to support the college programs and to develop needed services for business.

Objective: The system will increase its role in enhancing skills and services of small businesses, particularly those owned by ethnic minorities and women.

Objective: The occupational forecasting process will be enhanced to identify future as well as current needs for programs.

Objective: The funding process will encourage the development of workforce–related distance learning courses to assist in meeting the needs of training for our citizens.

One-Stop Centers

Initiatives at the Federal level have encouraged the state to restructure the local offices that deal with job training funds. There was hope that these funds would be sent to states with no strings attached. In anticipation of that happening, private industry councils were restructured as "workforce development boards," under the Jobs and Education Partnership of Enterprise Florida. One component of this effort, in conjunction with recent welfare reform efforts, is the creation of one-stop centers. The idea behind the one-stop centers is that a person in a community can go to one place to get all the services for which they are eligible, such as food stamps, child care, training, etc. Some of these one-stop centers are excellent, while others are one-stop centers in name only. The community college challenge for the future is to revisit those that are not effective and look at issues that have kept them from being strong.

Objective: One-Stop Centers will be fully funded by federal and state dollars other than those appropriated to the CCS.

Child Care and Transportation

Full access to community college programs is impeded by a lack of available, flexible child care and transportation. Access to child care will require the colleges to continue to develop creative methods of assisting in the provision of safe and secure situations for the children of the developing workforce students and the large numbers that are anticipated to begin educational activities as a result of the welfare to work initiative. Freeing a student from the worries of providing for their children during periods of absence has a direct impact on their educational success. Equally important is the need for transportation programs that will assure the ability of the student to attend classes at the appropriate time and place. Again, this will require creative efforts by the colleges to develop sites, public transportation partnerships, innovative communication and distance learning techniques, and private-public partnerships designed to enhance the ability of the developing student to interact with educational services.

Child care and transportation continue to be barriers to economically disadvantaged students, especially those served by WAGES and federal job training funds, receiving the education they need. The State Board needs to develop alternatives and proposals to support students with these needs.

Objective: Child care and transportation funds will be provided to meet the needs of workforce and WAGES clients.

Partnership Challenge

There are currently three main categories of partnerships for community colleges: those with other community college entities, with private business, and with other sectors of education. The first is with foundations and other direct support organizations (DSO's). These organizations have generated private contributions to allow individual colleges to acquire many types of equipment that they would not otherwise have been able to obtain. Foundations are also able to receive matching funds from the State. The ability of community college foundations to generate private contributions to match state appropriations has improved dramatically in recent years. In 1996-97, the legislative appropriations for the Phil Benjamin Academic Improvement Trust Fund, Health Care Challenge Grants and Scholarship Matching Programs totaled $10,251,670. The sum of appropriations for the State matching programs in 1998-99 equals $23,594,608.

A second type of internal partnership has eased the individual financial burden required to produce new software. There are four data base software consortiums in the state that share the costs of developing the computer programs needed to create the required state-level data bases.

The second major type of partners is with private business. System-wide agreements such as the one between Pensacola Junior College and the Dell computer company will allow all the institutions, staff and students of the CCS to purchase computers very economically. The institutions also have the options of leasing and/or financing in a way that ensures periodic upgrading of equipment. This partnership was established by the college without any State mandates.

There are also system-level partnerships with corporations such as Microsoft and CISCO. These partnerships will provide computer equipment and curriculum that will allow the institutions to train students as network technicians, one of the fastest growing occupations in the country.

The third major type of partnership is with other sectors of education. Community colleges have a long tradition of working with the K-12 sector via such programs as dual enrollment and CROP. They also have a long history of joint use facilities and joint programs with both public and private universities. Florida is unique in that it has an articulation agreement with both the public and private sectors. Most private universities in the state are members of Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida. By establishing an articulation agreement with this entity, the CCS was able to help students transfer to either the public or private sectors to complete the baccalaureate degree. (More information related to this agreement can be found in the section on Access Challenge - Formal Articulation Policies.) Often the physical aspects of transfer involve only walking across a courtyard since many colleges and universities provide upper level instruction directly on community college campuses. Several institutions have also established articulation agreements with area technical schools that allow for transferring block credits.

These partnerships provide opportunities for students to access either equipment or programs that allow them to better prepare themselves for the future.

Objective: The CCS will continue to develop partnerships, both as a system and among individual institutions, that reduce the financial burden required to provide students the most up-to-date education possible. The CCS will also maintain and enhance articulation agreements that will ensure students are able to transfer to both public and private colleges and universities as easily as possible.

CONCLUSION

In A Strategic Plan for the Millennium, the CCS and the SBCC have attempted to provide an approach and a series of objectives that will move Florida's twenty-eight community colleges into the next phase of its successful evolution.

Access to postsecondary education is fundamental for tomorrow's well prepared workforce. Florida must do whatever is necessary to ensure that its citizens have an opportunity to learn the skills necessary to participate in that workforce. The CCS is providing access to postsecondary education for a broad segment of society and will continue to work toward keeping the doors as open as possible.

In order to move Florida forward in the economic arena, the number of all types of postsecondary awards and degrees must be increased. Many events have already taken place that will help. For example, the new Sunshine State Standards that have been introduced into the K-12 system and the increased high school graduation requirements that have recently been signed into law should result in better prepared high school graduates entering the CCS and SUS. The new Entry Level Placement Test cut scores and the offering of the test after 10th grade should result in students receiving the help they need prior to attempting college level work. Cooperative Pre-K-16 initiatives should be fully explored prior to committing limited state dollars to a costly expansion of the number of postsecondary colleges or universities. New institutions would still face the low public school continuation rate (50.3 percent) and the high need for remediation.

It is essential that all sectors of postsecondary education in Florida work closely together to address student, community, and statewide needs in the coming five years. The public and independent sectors must work closely together to address the six challenges outlined in this Strategic Plan. The interdependence of our public schools, community colleges, and public and private universities was readily apparent during the public hearings and as the research related to the Plan was conducted. The trained workforce Florida will demand in the next millennium will require additional certificates, AA/AS and baccalaureate degrees. We can only get there through working with our public schools, the SUS and other postsecondary providers. The cooperative planning process, which has already begun related to a network of concurrent use campuses between the SUS and the CCS to expand baccalaureate access, is an early product of our strategic planning activities.

Now is a good time for all state planning efforts to focus on the reforms adopted by the 1997 Legislature, and to make every effort to assure they are given an opportunity to succeed. A better prepared workforce can only be a plus for the State and the CCS is committed to doing its part in producing workers who will be able to find and hold jobs in the twenty-first century.

References

Business/Higher Education Partnership (December, 1997). Bursting at the Seams. Tampa: Florida.

Central Florida Consortium of Higher Education (1997). Beyond Chalk. Orlando: Florida

Commission on Government Accountability to the People (February, 1998). Florida Benchmarks. Tallahassee: Florida.

Council on Competitiveness (May, 1998). Winning the Skills Race. Report to Congress. Washington: D.C.

Florida Department of Labor and Employment Security (1988). Florida's Workforce 2000. Tallahassee: Florida.

Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (1997). FETPIP Summary Reports. Department of Education, Tallahassee: Florida.

Florida TaxWatch, Inc. (1994). Florida's Educational Facilities Needs and Funding in the 21st Century. Tallahassee: Florida

Forgione, Pascal D. (1998) "Achievement in the United States: Progress Since a Nation at Risk?" Talk presented to the Center for Education Reform and Empower America, April 3, 1998.

Gates, Bill (1998). The Connected Learning Community. Microsoft in Higher Education. Redmond: West Virginia.

Hodgkinson, Harold (1992). Demographic Look at Tomorrow. Carnegie Corporation of New York. New York: New York.

Immerwahr, John (1998). The Price of Admission. The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. San Jose: California.

Miller, M. (1997). "Projected Florida High School Graduates 1997-98 - 2010-11." Office of Strategy Planning, Deputy Commissioner for Planning, Budgeting and Management, Florida Department of Education, December 1997. Tallahassee: Florida.

National Center for Education Statistics (1996). Digest of Education Statistics 1996. Table 240. Washington: D.C.

Postsecondary Education OPPORTUNITY (March, 1998). "Chance for College by Age 19 by State in 1996." Thomas G. Mortenson Editor. Number 69, pp. 1-7. Oskaloosa: Iowa.

Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (1991). Access to the Baccalaureate Degree. Tallahassee: Florida.

Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (1998). Challenges and Choices: The Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education. Tallahassee: Florida.

Southern Regional Education Board (October, 1997). Principles of Good Practice. Atlanta: Georgia.

State Board of Community Colleges (1993). The 1993 Master Plan for the Florida Community Colleges. Tallahassee: Florida.

State Board of Community Colleges (1997). "A Comparison of Community College Student Demographics by Program Area." Research Note 02, January 9. Tallahassee: Florida.

State University System (1997). Fact Book 1996-97. Florida Board of Regents. Tallahassee: Florida.

Uhlfelder, Steve (September, 1998). "My View." Tallahassee Democrat. Tallahassee: Florida.

University of Florida Press (1995). Florida Statistical Abstract. Table 5.46. The University of Florida, Gainesville: Florida.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Authorizing Statutes

240.147 Powers and duties of the commission.– The commission shall ..... 2) Prepare and submit to the State Board of Education a master plan for postsecondary education. The plan shall include consideration of the promotion of quality, fundamental educational goals, programmatic access, needs for remedial education, regional and state economic development, international education programs, demographic patterns, student demand for programs, needs of particular subgroups of the population, implementation of innovative educational techniques and technology, and the requirements of the labor market. The capacity of existing programs, in both public and independent institutions, to respond to identified needs shall be evaluated, and a plan shall be developed to respond efficiently to unmet needs. The master plan shall serve as the basis for the development of strategic plans by the Board of Regents, the State Board of Community Colleges, and the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida. Development of the sector strategic plans shall be initiated following completion of the master plan to ensure coordination in addressing identified needs and strategies throughout postsecondary education....

240.301 Community colleges; definition, mission, and responsibilities.–
(1) State community colleges shall consist of all public educational institutions operated by community college district boards of trustees under statutory authority and rules of the State Board of Education and the State Board of Community Colleges. A community college may provide adult education services, including adult basic education, adult general education, adult secondary education, and general educational development test instruction. The state community colleges are locally based and governed entities with statutory and funding ties to state government. As such, the community colleges' mission reflects a commitment to be responsive to local educational needs and challenges. In achieving this mission, the colleges strive to maintain sufficient local authority and flexibility while preserving appropriate legal accountability to the state.

(2) As comprehensive institutions, the community colleges shall provide high-quality, affordable education and training opportunities, shall foster a climate of excellence, and shall provide opportunities to all while combining high standards with an open-door admission policy. The community colleges shall, as open-access institutions, serve all who can benefit, without regard to age, race, gender, creed, or ethnic or economic background, while emphasizing the achievement of social and educational equity so that all can be prepared for full participation in society.
(3) The primary mission and responsibility of public community colleges is responding to community needs for postsecondary academic education and [1]degree career education. This mission and responsibility includes being responsible for:
(a) Providing lower level undergraduate instruction and awarding associate degrees.
(b) Preparing students directly for vocations requiring less than baccalaureate degrees. This may include preparing for job entry, supplementing of skills and knowledge, and responding to needs in new areas of technology. Career education in the community college shall consist of certificate career education programs leading to certificates for occupational completion points, credit courses leading to associate in science degrees and associate in applied technology degrees, and other programs in fields requiring substantial academic work, background, or qualifications. A community college may offer vocational programs in fields having lesser academic or technical requirements.
(c) Providing student development services, including assessment, student tracking, support for disabled students, advisement, counseling, financial aid, career development, and remedial and tutorial services, to ensure student success.
(d) Promoting economic development for the state within each community college district through the provision of special programs, including, but not limited to, the:
1. Enterprise Florida-related programs.
2. Technology transfer centers.
3. Economic development centers.

4. Workforce literacy programs.
(4) A separate and secondary role for community colleges includes the offering of programs in:
(a) Community services which are not directly related to academic or occupational advancement.
(b) Adult general education.
(c) Recreational and leisure services.
(5) Funding for community colleges shall reflect their mission as follows:
(a) Postsecondary academic and vocational education programs and adult general education programs shall have first priority in community college funding.
(b) Community service programs shall be presented to the Legislature with rationale for state funding. The Legislature may identify priority areas for use of these funds.
(6) Community colleges are authorized to offer such programs and courses as are necessary to fulfill their mission and are authorized to grant associate in arts degrees, associate in science degrees, associate in applied science degrees, certificates, awards, and diplomas. Each community college is also authorized to make provisions for the general educational development examination.
History.--s. 41, ch. 79-222; s. 14, ch. 83-326; s. 38, ch. 86-156; s. 3, ch. 87-326; s. 17, ch. 87-329; s. 2, ch. 88-399; s. 15, ch. 89-189; ss. 40, 52, ch. 89-381; s. 68, ch. 92-136; s. 18, ch. 94-230; s. 26, ch. 97-307.
[1]**Note.**--The term "degree career education" was substituted for the term "postsecondary vocational" by the editors pursuant to the directive of the Legislature in s. 16, ch. 94-232.

240.303 "Community college" and "junior college" used interchangeably.--Whenever the term "community college" appears in the Florida Statutes in reference to a tax-supported institution, it shall be construed to mean a "junior college."
History.--s. 5, ch. 70-198; s. 56, ch. 72-221; s. 42, ch. 79-222.
Note.--Former s. 230.741.

240.3031 Florida Community College System defined.--
The Florida Community College System shall consist of the following:
(1) The State Board of Community Colleges of the Division of Community Colleges of the Department of Education.
(2) Brevard Community College.
(3) Broward Community College.
(4) Central Florida Community College.
(5) Chipola Junior College.
(6) Daytona Beach Community College.
(7) Edison Community College.
(8) Florida Community College at Jacksonville.
(9) Florida Keys Community College.
(10) Gulf Coast Community College.
(11) Hillsborough Community College.
(12) Indian River Community College.
(13) Lake City Community College.
(14) Lake-Sumter Community College.
(15) Manatee Community College.
(16) Miami-Dade Community College.
(17) North Florida Community College.
(18) Okaloosa-Walton Community College.
(19) Palm Beach Community College.
(20) Pasco-Hernando Community College.
(21) Pensacola Junior College.
(22) Polk Community College.
(23) St. Johns River Community College.
(24) St. Petersburg Junior College.
(25) Santa Fe Community College.
(26) Seminole Community College.
(27) South Florida Community College.
(28) Tallahassee Community College.
(29) Valencia Community College.
History.--s. 2, ch. 87-132; s. 64, ch. 89-381; s. 4, ch. 89-535; s. 4, ch. 95-261; s. 3, ch. 95-432; s. 15, ch. 98-58.

240.305 State Board of Community Colleges; establishment.--
There is established a State Board of Community Colleges of the Department of Education with the necessary powers to exercise responsibility for statewide leadership in overseeing and coordinating the individually governed public community colleges. There shall continue to be maximum local autonomy in the governance and operation of individual community colleges. The board shall be subject at all times to the overall supervision of the State Board of Education.
History.--s. 43, ch. 79-222; s. 15, ch. 83-326.

240.307 State Board of Community Colleges; appointment of members; qualifications.--
(1) The State Board of Community Colleges shall be comprised of the Commissioner of Education, one student, and 11 lay citizens appointed by the

Governor, approved by four members of the State Board of Education, and confirmed by the Senate in regular session. The Commissioner of Education may nominate two or more persons for each position, prior to appointment by the Governor. The State Board of Education shall adopt rules and procedures for its review and approval of nominees. Members shall have been residents and citizens of this state for at least 10 years prior to appointment.

(a) All members shall be deemed to be members-at-large charged with the responsibility of serving the entire state.

(b) Terms of membership of the lay citizens shall be for 5 years.

(c) Lay citizen members of the State Board of Community Colleges shall be appointed in a manner providing equitable geographical representation.

(d) The student member shall be registered as a student in a public community college and shall have been a resident of this state for at least 5 years. His or her term of office shall be 1 year.

(2) Each member shall serve until expiration of his or her term and until his or her successor is appointed and qualified, except in the case of an appointment to fill a vacancy, in which case the appointment shall be for the unexpired term, and except as otherwise provided by this section. The Governor shall fill all vacancies that may at any time occur therein, subject to the above approval and confirmation.

(3) Members may be removed for cause at any time upon the concurrence of a majority of the members of the State Board of Education.

(4) The members of the State Board of Community Colleges shall receive no compensation but shall be paid travel and per diem as provided in s. 112.061 while in the performance of their duties and in traveling to, from, or upon the same.

History.--s. 44, ch. 79-222; s. 15, ch. 81-193; s. 150, ch. 81-259; s. 16, ch. 83-326; s. 3, ch. 91-49;

(2) The State Board of Community Colleges is responsible for the operation and maintenance of a state community college system, as defined in s. 228.041(1)(b), in a coordinated, efficient, and effective manner. The State Board of Community Colleges has authority to adopt rules pursuant to ss. 120.536(1) and 120.54 to implement provisions of law conferring duties upon it. Such rules and policies shall be submitted to the State Board of Education for approval. If any rule is not disapproved by the State Board of Education within 45 days of its receipt by the State Board of Education, the rule shall be filed immediately with the Department of State.

(3) The State Board of Community Colleges shall:

(a) Provide for each community college to offer

s. 44, ch. 95-148.

240.309 State Board of Community Colleges; organization; meetings; fiscal year.--

(1) The State Board of Community Colleges shall, within 60 days after its appointment, organize, adopt a seal, and adopt rules for administration and procedures not inconsistent herewith and may from time to time amend such rules. At its organizational meeting, the board shall elect from among its members a chair and vice chair, each to serve for 1 year, and annually thereafter shall elect such officers who shall serve for 1-year terms until their successors are elected. At its organizational meeting, the board shall fix a date and place for its regular meetings. Seven members shall constitute a quorum, and no meeting may be held with less than a quorum present. The board may appoint members to such committees as it from time to time shall establish. Members of such committees may include persons who are not members of the board.

(2) Special meetings of the board may be called as provided by the board in its rules. Regular meetings of the board shall normally be held at the offices of the board, which shall be in Leon County, but, whenever the convenience of the public may be promoted, the board may hold meetings, hearings, and proceedings at any other place in the state designated by the board.

(3) The board shall meet not less than four times in every fiscal year.

(4) The fiscal year of the board shall conform to the fiscal year of the state.

History.--s. 45, ch. 79-222; s. 17, ch. 83-326; s. 45, ch. 95-148.

240.311 State Board of Community Colleges; powers and duties.--

(1) The State Board of Community Colleges shall serve as the director of the Division of Community Colleges of the Department of Education.

educational training and service programs designed to meet the needs of both students and the communities served.
(b) Provide, through rule, for the coordination of the Florida Community College System.
(c) Review new associate degree, diploma, and certificate programs for relationship to student demand; conduct periodic reviews of existing programs; and provide rules for termination of associate degree or certificate programs when excessive duplication exists.
(d) Ensure that the rules and procedures of community college district boards relating to admission to, enrollment in, employment in, and programs, services, functions, and activities of each college provide equal access and equal opportunity for all persons.
(e) Advise presidents of community colleges of the fiscal policies adopted by the Legislature and of their responsibilities to follow such policies.
(f) Specify, by rule, procedures to be used by the boards of trustees in the annual evaluations of presidents and formally review the evaluations of presidents by the boards of trustees.
(g) Recommend to the State Board of Education minimum standards for the operation of each community college as required in s. 240.325, which standards may include, but are not limited to, general qualifications of personnel, budgeting, accounting and financial procedures, educational programs, student admissions and services, and community services.
(h) Establish an effective information system which will provide composite data about the community colleges and assure that special analyses and studies about the colleges are conducted, as necessary, for provision of accurate and cost-effective information about the colleges and about the community college system as a whole.
(i) Encourage the colleges and the system as a whole to cooperate with other educational institutions and agencies and with all levels and agencies of government in the interest of effective utilization of all resources, programs, and services.
(j) Establish criteria for making recommendations relative to modifying district boundary lines and
(p) Encourage and support activities which promote and advance college and statewide direct-support organizations.
(q) Specify, by rule, the degree program courses for making recommendations upon all proposals for the establishment of additional centers or campuses for community colleges.
(k) Develop a plan in cooperation with the local school district and the Department of Education to include any and all counties in a community college service district.
(l) Assess the need to consolidate any community colleges.
(m) Develop and adopt guidelines relating to salary and fringe benefit policies for community college administrators, including community college presidents.
(n) Develop and adopt guidelines relating to official travel by community college employees.
(o) Receive an annual administrative review of each community college.
1. Such review shall include, but is not limited to, the administrator-to-faculty ratio, the percent of funds for administrative costs in the total budget, and the percent of funds in support programs compared to the percent of funds in instructional programs and may include such other indicators of quality as are necessary.
2. The review shall also include all courses offered by a community college outside its district. Courses offered outside the home district which are not approved by the State Board of Community Colleges shall not be counted for funding purposes or to meet enrollment assignments. For purposes of this subparagraph, electronically originated instruction, to include satellite, broadcast, and Internet delivered instruction, shall be exempt. Exemption is only permitted when the community college's intent is to offer the instruction for students residing within the community college's home district and only markets the instruction to students residing within the community college's home district. If a community college's intent is to market the electronically originated instruction outside its home district and thus recruit students outside its home district, the community college must receive the approval of the State Board of Community Colleges. The State Board of Community Colleges shall have authority to review any electronically originated instruction for compliance with this section.
that may be taken by students concurrently enrolled in college-preparatory instruction.
(4) The State Board of Community Colleges shall appoint, and may suspend or dismiss, an executive

director of the community college system. The board shall fix the compensation for the executive director and for all other professional, administrative, and clerical employees necessary to assist the board and the executive director in the performance of their duties. The executive director shall serve as executive officer and as secretary to the board; shall attend, but not vote at, all meetings of the board except when on authorized leave; shall be in charge of the offices of the board, including appointment and termination of staff; and shall be responsible for the preparation of reports and the collection and dissemination of data and other public information relating to the [1]State Community College System. The executive director shall conduct systemwide program reviews for board approval; prepare the legislative budget request for the system; and, upon the request of the board, represent the system before the Legislature and the State Board of Education, including representation in the presentation of proposed rules to the State Board of Education. The board may, by rule, delegate to the executive director any of the powers and duties vested in or imposed upon it by this part. Under the supervision of the board, the executive director shall administer the provisions of this part and the rules established hereunder and all other applicable laws of the state.

(5) The State Board of Community Colleges is responsible for reviewing and administering the state program of support for the Florida Community College System and, subject to existing law, shall:

(a) Review and approve all budgets and recommended budget amendments in the Florida Community College System.

(b) Recommend to the Commissioner of Education all requests for appropriations for inclusion in the Commissioner of Education's budget presentation to the Governor, as chief budget officer of the state, in the manner provided in chapter 216.

(c) Provide for and coordinate implementation of the community college program fund in accordance with provisions of ss. 240.359 and 240.323 and in accordance with rules of the State Board of Education.

(d) Adopt, and submit to the Legislature, a 3-year list of priorities for fixed capital outlay projects.

(6) The State Board of Community Colleges is authorized to exercise any other powers, duties, and responsibilities necessary to carry out the purposes of this part, except that powers and duties granted to the several district boards of trustees by ss. 240.315, 240.317, 240.319, and 447.203 shall remain with the several district boards of trustees.

(7) The State Board of Community Colleges shall adopt rules and procedures to be followed by district boards of trustees for the recruitment, consideration, and selection process for presidents of the community colleges. The rules or procedures shall address, at a minimum, the following: the composition of a search committee that provides for membership representing the gender and ethnic diversity of the community, faculty, students, and staff; the program mix of the community college and priorities of the community and board of trustees; and a recruitment and consideration process that provides a candidate pool with ethnic and gender diversity appropriate for the community college district. The district board of trustees is responsible for the appointment of the community college president, pursuant to [2]s. 240.319(3)(a). Upon selection of a president by a board of trustees, the board of trustees shall submit a report to the State Board of Community Colleges documenting compliance with this subsection.

History.--s. 46, ch. 79-222; s. 5, ch. 81-193; s. 151, ch. 81-259; s. 37, ch. 82-241; s. 18, ch. 83-326; s. 30, ch. 84-336; s. 14, ch. 85-196; s. 40, ch. 94-230; ss. 6, 10, ch. 95-392; s. 6, ch. 95-411; s. 16, ch. 98-58; s. 2, ch. 98-99; s. 36, ch. 98-200; s. 7, ch. 98-421.

[1]**Note.**--Redesignated as the Florida Community College System by s. 15, ch. 98-58.

[2]**Note.**--Redesignated as s. 240.319(4)(a) by s. 12, ch. 97-246.

APPENDIX B

Postsecondary Education Planning Commission Goals

Access

1. Florida postsecondary institutions must focus on their individual strengths while enabling the system as a whole to adjust to the demands of the new economy.

2. Florida must provide increased opportunities for access to higher education.

3. Florida must increase the productivity of the postsecondary education system.

4. Florida must use educational and telecommunications technologies to improve student learning, access to the associate and baccalaureate degrees, and overall institutional efficiency.

Interdependence: A Seamless System

1. Florida must provide a seamless system of quality education for its residents from pre-kindergarten through graduate school and beyond.

2. Florida schools must employ competent and caring teachers who have the knowledge and skills needed to meet the diverse needs and to optimize the achievement of their students.

Outcomes

1. Florida must produce an educated populace prepared to use intellectual resources in the workplace and to advance the economic and social conditions of the state.

2. Florida must increase the postsecondary education attainment of Floridians to meet workforce demand and to provide the intellectual resources for knowledge-based employment.

3. Florida must promote discovery and application of knowledge to improve its position in the interdependent global economy.

Funding

1. Florida must find new ways to provide affordable access to a high quality postsecondary education, based on a fair investment by all involved C students, the state and local community, business and industry.

Postsecondary Education Planning Commission Recommendations

Access

1. Each institution, with appropriate direction from governing and coordinating boards, should identify its distinctive mission and focus its resources on its strengths and priorities. The roles of different institutions should be coordinated so that, taken together, they meet important state needs and reflect a cost effective use of state resources.

2. The legislature must provide additional funding for meeting the access demands for higher education.

3. No single response will assure quality and cost effectiveness in meeting the access needs of our state. A combination of the responses identified above should be used to meet those needs.

4. Any four-year public postsecondary institution authorized in the future in Florida should not include doctoral education and research as part of its mission.

5. The Postsecondary Education Planning Commission should develop a feasibility plan outlining the actions necessary to create a Amiddle tier@ system for our state. The plan should address governance issues related to implementation of this response to access. This plan should be completed by December 31, 1998, for submission to the Legislature for consideration.

6. The Board of Regents should prepare a detailed plan for expanding the joint-use model. The plan should address the anticipated number and location, optimal size, instructional loads of faculty, and anticipated funding requests for both operating and capital costs of these joint-use centers (both in total funding and on a per-student basis). This plan should be completed by December 31, 1998, for review by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission and submission to the Legislature.

7. The State Board of Community Colleges should develop a methodology for determining the need for and costs of offering limited baccalaureate programs at selected community colleges. These recommendations should be completed by December 31, 1998, for review by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission and submission to the Legislature.

8. The Postsecondary Education Planning Commission should be charged with program approval for baccalaureate programs for community colleges. This process would be similar to the existing contract approval process used by independent institutions. The Commission should work with the State Board of Community Colleges (SBCC) in developing this baccalaureate program approval process. No community college should be allowed to request a change in institutional accreditation status without approval of the SBCC and the Commission.

9. The Articulation Coordinating Committee should examine the feasibility of further integrating the educational experience across the public and private sectors and recommend

specific measures that would reduce any artificial barriers that currently exist. Such recommendations should include how the high school curriculum can be improved and integrated with the general education curriculum now present in postsecondary education to reduce curricular redundancy, decrease the need for remediation, and foster student degree attainment.

10. Priority for performance based incentive funding should be given to improving completion rates in high failure rate (bottleneck) courses.

11. The Board of Regents and the State Board of Community Colleges should eliminate any policy that restricts student access to instructional courses and programs using distance learning technologies.

12. Each state university and community college should provide all students with current and accurate information about the process for seeking financial aid and the acceptance for credit toward a degree for courses that originate from outside institutions.

13. The Board of Regents and the State Board of Community Colleges should examine the feasibility of providing degree-granting authority through an existing institution or a Avirtual institution@ for students who wish to complete large portions of their course work through alternative means.

14. The Board of Regents and the State Board of Community Colleges should focus on providing the required tools, training, and technological support to faculty members necessary to enhance or adapt their delivery of instruction.

15. The Board of Regents and the State Board of Community Colleges should review the traditional faculty reward structure to ensure that adequate attention is devoted to the technology training and course development at the institutional level. Faculty members should be required to attain a minimal level of technological ability as a condition of employment.

16. The Legislature should adapt the Teaching Incentive Program to reward faculty members who successfully convert or adapt their course materials for effective electronic delivery.

17. State universities and community colleges offering distance learning courses and degree programs should be required to develop a plan that ensures students who are enrolled in such degree programs will be provided appropriate student support services. The plan should include a description of the services to be provided and provision for funding the delivery of such services.

18. The current design and implementation of the Statewide Student Academic Advising System should be reconsidered so that the experience of other state systems and the needs and benefits to students can be more readily considered and included.

19. The Board of Regents and State Board of Community Colleges should conduct a review of

equipment procurement plans and replacement policies for advanced telecommunications and computer technologies and make recommendations concerning the feasibility of shifting the costs of technology away from capital expenses (operating capital outlay) to ongoing expense categories through short-term lease arrangement or other means. The review could also include the consideration of plans to require students to obtain computers as a condition of their enrollment.

20. The Board of Regents, State Board of Community Colleges, and state libraries should place a high priority on the statewide purchase and/or licensing of on-line databases and related instructional materials or equipment.

Interdependence - A Seamless System

1. The Department of Education should establish as a goal the attainment of the College Ready Diploma as a requirement for graduation from all Florida public schools.

2. The Board of Regents and the State Board of Community Colleges should work collaboratively with the Department of Education to encourage all high school students to take the college preparatory curriculum.

3. The Department of Education should encourage counseling programs in all middle and high schools to explain to students the curricular requirements of the college-ready diploma and academic competencies needed for successful postsecondary work and to provide parents with information on the value of the college-ready diploma curriculum for academic success at the postsecondary level and success in the workplace.

4. All universities, community colleges, vocational centers, and public schools should provide comprehensive career services for students that will link academic programs with careers and will provide students with experiential work internships and cooperative education opportunities.

5. The Department of Education, in conjunction with the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, the Florida Commission on Education Reform and Accountability, and the postsecondary sector boards should identify, for each education level beyond high school, the communication and computation skills that are required for academic success.

6. To address the academic preparation of public school graduates, particularly in urban schools, the Board of Regents, the State Board of Community Colleges, and the State Board of Independent Colleges and Universities should direct all postsecondary institutions to establish educational partnerships with schools in their service area and/or region. This directive should be stated as a priority goal in the Strategic Plans of the sector boards.

7. Each postsecondary institution should develop an action plan in conjunction with its public school partners that identifies specific activities to improve the public schools and that increases the number and percentage of qualified students who graduate from high school and who are academically prepared for postsecondary education and the workplace. The action plans should be presented to each state board for review and endorsement.

8. The Board of Regents, the State Board of Community Colleges, and the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida should review the effectiveness of all existing articulation agreements to ensure that barriers do not exist to the smooth transition of students from one educational level to another.

9. The Board of Regents should ensure that the participation in public school partnership activities by State University System faculty and administrators from all academic disciplines is recognized in the service component of the faculty tenure system.

10. All Florida teacher preparation programs in secondary education should include an arts and sciences discipline major and should include instruction in student diversity, performance assessment, educational technology, exceptional education, English as a Second Language (ESL), and early and varied field experiences in schools.

11. The curriculum of all teacher preparation programs in Florida should be structured so that, prior to graduation, teacher candidates are able to demonstrate successfully specific skills/competencies, as identified in the 12 educator-accomplished practices, and are able to teach and assess the content in the Sunshine State Standards.

12. The Department of Education, in conjunction with the school districts and the state=s teacher preparation programs, should implement a performance-based teacher certification system that will provide sufficient flexibility to attract qualified individuals to the teaching profession through the validation of competencies that directly relate to teacher effectiveness.

13. Florida=s teacher preparation programs should adopt the following priority goals, and these goals should be stated in the Strategic Plans of the sector boards:

    (1) to restructure their curriculum to prepare teachers that will meet the educational needs of urban school students and will improve student achievement and success in urban school environments.

    (2) to recruit, retain, and graduate higher numbers of minority teachers.

14. The Legislature should expand the Minority Teacher Education Scholarship Program through increased funding to support minority teacher candidates.

15. The Department of Education must take the lead in the statewide implementation of an action plan to enhance the teaching profession. The Action Plan should address the following priority goals:

    (1) raise teacher salaries to the upper quartile nationally;
    (2) provide regular in-service professional development for teachers and administrators; and,
    (3) ensure a safe and professional work environment for teachers.

16. The Department of Education, in conjunction with the state school district personnel offices and the state teacher preparation programs, should establish a statewide database to report school district teacher vacancies and maintain qualified applications on file, both by school level and by degree specialty, and should implement a standard computerized application form for electronic transmittal by teacher candidates and for access by school employers.

17. The Department of Education should annually analyze information collected by school districts via exit interviews as to why teachers leave the profession.

Outcomes

1. The State should increase the percentage of Florida=s high school graduates who participate in postsecondary education immediately following high school graduation.

Enrollment Immediately Following High School Graduation

Florida Target (2000): 65%
Florida Target (2010): 75%

2. The State should increase the postsecondary completion rate for Florida high school graduates by identifying and addressing factors that affect the progression of students through the education system. The State should minimize and eliminate the structural, financial, and programmatic barriers to degree attainment.

Postsecondary Completion per High School Graduation Cohort

Florida Target 2000 (1990-91 High School Graduation Cohort):

- $ Completion of Associate Degree/Vocational Certificate: 19% within 10 years
- $ Completion of Baccalaureate or Higher Degree: 20% within 10 years

Florida Target 2010 (2000-01 High School Graduation Cohort):

- $ Completion of Associates Degree/Vocational Certificate: 25% within 10 years
- $ Completion of Baccalaureate or Higher Degree: 25% within 10 years

3. The State should increase the number of baccalaureate degrees granted per 100,000 18-44-year-old population to the average degrees granted in the top ten economically strong states.

Degrees per Working-age Population

Florida Target 2000: 80% of Top Ten Average
Florida Target 2010: 90% of Top Ten Average

4. Postsecondary institutions should recruit working age residents who have not completed postsecondary programs to return and complete those programs. The State should encourage residents to advance their education beyond their current level. The State should minimize and eliminate structural, financial, and programmatic barriers for returning adult students.

5. The state=s workforce development initiatives and educational institutions should prepare working age adult Floridians who require government assistance for entry into and advancement in the workforce by increasing their literacy proficiency and occupational skills.

6. Postsecondary institutions should continue to form and enhance business, industry, and government partnerships that promote economic growth, research and development, graduate student training, and facilitate the transfer of people and ideas from academe into the workforce.

7. Postsecondary institutions and sector boards should target resources on fields in which education and industry share mutual strengths.

8. Postsecondary institutions should strengthen partnerships with public education to ensure that students are encouraged and prepared to pursue higher education opportunities in engineering and the sciences.

9. Postsecondary institutions and sectors should increase the number of graduate students, particularly among underrepresented populations, in science and engineering through stipends, graduate fee waivers, and research and employment opportunities with state government, business, and industry.

10. Postsecondary institutions should collaborate with business and industry to ensure that a higher share of graduates from science and engineering fields are hired in Florida.

11. Postsecondary institutions and the sector boards should seek additional financial support from business and industry partners who benefit from the intellectual resources provided by postsecondary institutions in Florida. When forming research partnerships, preference should be given to those industries that provide opportunities for graduate student training and employment.

12. Postsecondary institutions should develop additional, diversified sources of federal support in areas of research and development. Institutions receiving the bulk of federal support should consider working cooperatively on sponsored projects with other less well-funded SUS institutions.

13. In collaboration with postsecondary institutions, the sectors should identify needs of the State that are critical to improving the quality of life for all Floridians. The SUS should continue its strong encouragement of faculty in seeking funding for and engaging in research projects related to identified critical state needs.

14. The Legislature should allocate a specific proportion of general revenue funds allotted each

year to the public universities to promote private-public partnerships to conduct applied research critical to Florida's needs.

Funding

1. The Legislature and the sectors should continue to focus on performance at the state level through the use of incentive funding with a limited share of the overall budget.

2. The Commission, in cooperation with the sectors, should recognize and reward individual institutions= efforts to apply the principles of performance funding and productivity management.

3. The Legislature and the Board of Regents should adopt a revised university funding methodology that more accurately reflects the level of research and instruction provided by each institution in accordance with its individual mission. This funding methodology should distinguish costs for lower and upper level undergraduate instruction as well as master=s, doctoral, and professional.

4. As a supplement to the adopted funding methodology, the Legislature and the Board of Regents should establish an incentive grant fund that would recognize and reward individual institutional success in obtaining external research support.

5. The Governor=s Commission on Education should examine facility needs at the public postsecondary level, taking into account existing capacity, need for additional space, maintenance and repair, accountability, and either expansion of current fund sources or identification of new sources of support.

6. Once public school facility needs are addressed, the Legislature should implement the Governor=s Commission on Education recommendation that a majority (at least 60 percent) of PECO funding go to the postsecondary level. Each sector=s share of the increase should be based on future enrollment and unmet need.

7. The Legislature should allow the sector boards to move Florida from a low tuition/low aid state to at least the national averages in there areas. The share of educational costs borne by students should not exceed 40 percent. The percentage of state revenue dedicated to postsecondary education must not be further reduced or replaced by any revenue resulting from increased tuition. An amount equal to at least 25 percent of any tuition increase should be dedicated to need-based financial assistance.

8. All applicants for any state student financial assistance should submit need analysis data. The Department of Education and the sector boards should base future requests for need-based aid on the number of eligible applicants, taking into account tuition increases and other factors affecting the extent of need.

9. The Legislature should require that supplemental vocational training be self-supporting with the costs borne by the employers and employees who are involved.

10. The Legislature should extend the Florida Prepaid College Program=s coverage to include local fees and other federally authorized college costs. In addition, the Legislature should provide funding that will enable the Program to match additional private-sector donations to increase Project STARS outreach to lower income students. The future role and scope of the Prepaid Program should be examined by its Board and the Legislature in light of recent federal legislation authorizing additional savings and tax credit options.

11. The Florida Prepaid Tuition Program must not become a major factor in determining the state=s future tuition policy. The Legislature should not constrain its tuition decisions based on the actuarial projections of the Prepaid Program since the program has a variety of options available for addressing tuition increases that exceed the current rate projections.

12. The State should continue to invest in the Florida Resident Access Grant as well as other programs that will maximize the contribution of independent postsecondary education to Floridians.

13. The principals involved in the Education Estimating Conference conducted pursuant to s. 216.136(4), F.S., should include the independent sector in the enrollment estimating process in recognition of the important role these institutions play in providing access.

14. The process used to estimate and fund Florida Resident Access Grant (FRAG) recipients as well as candidates for need-based student assistance should be comparable to that used to calculate enrollment workload funding for state universities and public community colleges.

APPENDIX C

Academic Ethics Statement

Community College Faculty Leaders= Coalition of Florida

Introduction:

Faculty, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. To this end faculty devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty.

As teachers, faculty encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. They demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Faculty make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student=s true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them.

As colleagues, faculty have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates.

Faculty at Florida=s Community Colleges should seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Faculty should give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within the college in determining the amount and character of work done outside it.

As members of their community, faculty have the rights and obligations of other citizens. They measure the urgency of these obligations in the light of their responsibilities to their students, to their subject, to their profession, and to their institution. When they speak or act as private persons, they avoid creating the impression of speaking or acting for their college or university. As citizens engaged in a profession that depends upon freedom for its health and integrity, professors have a particular obligation to promote conditions of free inquiry and to further public understanding of academic freedom.

A. Developing Scholarly Competence

Every discipline requires scholarship. Faculty must keep up with new developments in their disciplines and in teaching methods. It is a faculty member=s obligation to pursue professional and academic development enabling him or her to infuse appropriate changes in curriculum as necessary.

In addition, faculty have academic freedom to pursue the truth. The intellectual virtues of being

open-minded, fair, honest and objective in the consideration of differing views, being thorough in research, avoiding the manipulation of data, reaching a well-reasoned viewpoint, and the like, should all be fostered within the intellectual character of the faculty member.

These attitudes toward learning are precisely what faculty are trying to get their students to acquire, therefore, faculty are obligated to teach and lead by example. Modeling and teaching critical thinking and attempting to instill in students intellectual virtues which foster critical thinking is a key responsibility for faculty.

In other words, modeling a democratic style rather than an authoritarian one is appropriate. Instead of trying to control the beliefs, opinions and values of our students, encouraging pluralistic dialogue is an ethical necessity. Teaching students, by the example of our classes, to respect differing views and how to benefit from the wisdom often found in ideas with which one disagrees can provide a profound learning experience for students.

B. Maintaining Honest Academic Conduct

Faculty need to openly express a zero tolerance policy toward academic dishonesty. Faculty have an obligation to ensure that students understand and appreciate the concept of academic honesty and do their own work. Types of dishonesty include copying from others, turning in work that is not the student=s own, and using references without appropriate citation. Faculty, through discussion and in writing, must provide a definition of acceptable academic conduct on the first day of class. Furthermore, setting up testing situations that minimize the potential for misconduct is an essential strategy for preventing academic dishonesty.

C. Ensuring Cultural and Gender Sensitivity:

Respecting students as individuals is an ethical imperative for faculty. All students, as individuals, deserve the respect of faculty regardless of their cultural background, ethnicity, race, gender, religious beliefs, political ideologies, disability, sexual preference, age, or socioeconomic status.

Students look to faculty as role models. Not only must faculty exhibit an appreciation and respect for students from all backgrounds, but it is also imperative that they teach and model behavior which is tolerant and shows appreciation and respect for others within their respective disciplines. Affirming individual students= abilities, strengthening their self identities, and assisting them to reach their full potential should be a goal for Florida=s Community College faculty.

D. Encouraging the Free Pursuit of Learning:

The idea of open access is the quintessential expression of democracy in education and open access exemplifies the free pursuit of learning.

E. Creating a Learning Environment of Trust and Sensitivity:

Exploitation of students by faculty members is to be avoided at all costs. It is a fundamental ethical principle that individuals in power and authority should not use their advantaged position for their

own gain or to advance their own self-interest.

F. Establishing Academic Standards:

Florida=s community colleges have the dual mission of preparing individuals for work and citizenship. Successful careers depend on acquiring the skills, knowledge and abilities to perform competently in the work place and at the institutions of advanced learning sought by our students. So, to prepare students for the world of work and to avoid misleading them as to what they can expect once they leave the campus, it is important to evaluate students in a manner which is consistent with the academic standards of the discipline.

Academic standards should be determined in the context of one=s academic discipline by the community of scholars within the discipline. They should not differ significantly from one faculty member to another within the same discipline teaching similar course(s).

G. Maintaining Academic Freedom:

By nature and definition, a college campus embraces the value of academic freedom. In order to pursue truth, survey the marketplace of ideas, and acquire knowledge and understanding, both faculty and students must have the freedom to express their views and be safe from reprisals. However, there are obligations which accompany academic freedom.

The first obligation in maintaining academic freedom is to create a learning environment in the classroom which fosters the free exchange of ideas. In other words, we should encourage the expression of diverse views and the understanding of those views. For example, if the instructor of a philosophy class permitted only the view of atheism to be expressed and did not allow the counter view of theism to be expressed, or the contrary, that instructor would be undermining academic freedom.

The second obligation which is required to maintain academic freedom is to clearly distinguish when one is speaking for him or herself and when one is speaking as a representative of the educational institution. The classroom in particular should not be used as a forum for the advancement of personal causes. Our obligation is to inform, not to indoctrinate. If a stormy political issue arises, we can certainly encourage a lively discussion of all facets of the situation. However, we cannot present just our view or advocate only our own position unless we do so in the context of debate or other such pedagogical structures where opposing views may be presented.

H. Conclusion:

Being a faculty member in Florida=s community college system means being a colleague in a profession which involves participating in a profession where education and the pursuit of truth and freedom of expression are of paramount importance to ensure the open exchange of ideas.

The document was adapted from ethics statements of the Florida Department of Education, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges and AAUP. It may be found on the Internet on the CCFLC web site: http://inst.santafe.cc.fl.us/~ccflc/ETHICS1.HTM

APPENDIX D

Design Team Report

APPENDIX E

SBCC Strategic Plan Task Force Members

Mr. Joseph H. Lang, Member, SBCC, Chair

Mr. C. Ronald Belton, Member, SBCC

Dr. Charles R. Dassance, President, Central Florida Community College

Mr. Michael A. Elam, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs, Martin Center, Community College at Jacksonville, Council of Student Affairs

Mr. Randall W. Hanna, Member, SBCC

Dr. Jean Hunter, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Broward Community College, Council on Instructional Affairs

Dr. Robert W. Judson, Jr., President, Pasco-Hernando Community College

Mr. Barry A. Keim, Vice President for Administration and Finance, Indian River Community College, Council on Business Affairs

Dr. Beverlee McClure, Provost, St. Augustine Campus, St. Johns River Community College

Ms. Marjorie Starnes, Member, SBCC

Dr. Steven Wallace, President, Florida Community College at Jacksonville

SBCC Staff:

Dr. Thomas E. Furlong, Jr., Deputy Executive Director for Educational Services

Mr. Edward L. Cisek, Deputy Executive Director for Finance & Information Systems

Dr. Patricia Windham, Director of Educational Effectiveness and Research

APPENDIX F

OBJECTIVES

Underlying Principles

Objective: The number of SUS entering lower level FTE will be regulated in a manner that recognizes the integrity of the 2+2 system. The BOR and SBCC will jointly develop a plan to increase effective postsecondary education access in Florida through a network of concurrent use campuses located on existing community college sites.

Objective: Trustee training is essential to the community college governance idea of local control. The SBCC will include monies to support trustee training in its budget request and will develop a means of recognizing those institutions with formally trained/certified trustees. Preference for re-appointment should be given to persons who complete this process.

Planning Context

Objective: Provide more intensive training in the basic skills in the GED Preparatory classes Individuals passing the GED tests are not able, in 79% of the cases, to pass the community college entry-level math test. Support the recommendation of the Workforce Development Task Force, which advocates raising the passing scores to 45 on the five GED tests.

Objective: The Division of Community Colleges, in cooperation with the colleges, should develop an MIS process at the state and local level to track the performance of students in GED preparatory classes on the GED tests. The development of such a database would enable more effective assessment of GED test performance of students taking GED preparatory classes as compared with students who took no classes before testing.

Objective: The CCS will retain its commitment to Staff and Program Development and will continue to encourage individual institutions to use those funds for upgrading skills in the areas of curriculum development, distance learning, adaptive technology and in teaching students from diverse cultures.

Adequacy Challenge

Objective: The standard matriculation fee will remain at 25% of cost. Boards of trustees should be authorized to establish a matriculation fee that varies no more than 10% below and 15% above the standard fee. The additional 5% flexibility on the upper range of the standard fee should be dedicated to security and safety improvements. A separate technology fee should be statutorily created, and colleges should be authorized to pledge the revenue stream as security against debt. The capital improvement fee should be changed from $1.00 per credit hour to 10% of the matriculation fee.

Objective: The allocation of PECO dollars shall be changed in a manner to restore the original emphasis on higher education. Proposed allocation objectives are 50% for K-12 and 25% each for the SUS and CCS by the year 2000 and an equal partnership of 33.3% each for K-12, the SUS and the CCS by the year 2010.

Access Challenge

Objective: Each college shall continue and strengthen its efforts to ensure that no student, employee, or citizen is discriminated against, excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of a program, service, or activity provided by the college on the bases of sex, race, national origin, disability, or marital status.

Objective: The State Board of Education should maintain the new standards for high school graduation, provide increased academic support, and evaluate their effectiveness on a periodic basis.

Objective: The SBCC shall maintain College Preparatory courses while working with the K-12 system to increase standards and working with the SUS to ensure the CCS component of teacher preparation is appropriate and content rigorous.

Objective: The CCS will continue to work with the SUS in developing joint programs, joint facilities, concurrent use campuses and other appropriate responses to meet the need to increase access to postsecondary education programs. An SUS/CCS Task Force shall be established to develop a plan for a statewide network of concurrent use campuses.

Objective: The SBCC shall define the associate in applied science degree as a career degree that may articulate on an individual basis and redefine the associate in science degree as a career degree and a transfer degree. The SACS transfer requirements will be considered in the definition of the two associate degrees, so that articulation of the associate in science degree can be facilitated. Upon satisfactory completion of the work of the faculty discipline committees, the SBCC will seek to amend Rule 6A-14.030, F.A.C., to conform it to the recommended definitions.

Objective: The DCC and the Division of Workforce Development will work towards an accepted validation process that facilitates the transfer of students without jeopardizing the accreditation standing of any institution, whether they be SACS or COE accredited.

Objective: The DCC and ICUF will continue to work together to ensure their articulation agreement meets the needs of students transferring from one sector to the other.

Objective: The SBCC will continue to support the development of the Statewide Student Advising System and each community college will commit to supporting the implementation of the system on their campus with appropriate adaptations for students with physical impairments.

Objective: The FSAG program will receive, at a minimum, additional funding to ensure that all students eligible for Pell Grants will also receive state need-based support.

Objective: Since over 60% of community college students enroll as part-time students and other assistance programs allow part-time students to participate, state need-based programs should be made available to part-time students. In addition, community colleges should review their total available funds for financial aid (federal, state, and local) and develop a plan for distributing their merit and need-based aid to their student population.

Objective: The CCS supports the review of the Bright Futures Scholarship Program and merit based aid. Recommendations from the joint review group should be acted on by the SBCC prior to the 1999 Legislative Session.

Objective: Community colleges are encouraged to incorporate the provisions of community service opportunities, volunteer opportunities in social service agencies and public schools, as well as service-learning curriculum components into both their institutional goals and their institutional effectiveness plans. Consideration will be given by the colleges to linking community service hours to some of their local scholarship programs.

Objective: The Council on Instructional Affairs and the Council of Student Affairs are encouraged to develop staff in-service training opportunities for their members that will allow further sharing of model programs in community service and service-learning throughout the colleges.

Technology Challenge

Objective: All students will have computer access at home or in special on-campus labs. The colleges will explore leasing options as part of their efforts to keep all PC's updated and readily available to students.

Objective: The CCS will continue to place a high priority on the statewide purchase and licensing of on-line databases and related instructional materials and equipment through the expansion of the CCLA and other initiatives.

Objective: The CCS will work closely with the SUS and independent colleges to implement the virtual college recommendations contained in the Design Team's final report (Appendix D).

Objective: In order to ensure the necessary funds are available, the CCS will include in its Legislative budget request funds to reward faculty members who successfully convert or adapt their course materials for effective electronic delivery.

Objective: The CCS will continue to encourage innovative procurement plans and replacement policies for advanced telecommunications and computer technologies and other critical equipment needs. The System will recommend in its budget requests the funding of technology as an ongoing expense.

Performance Challenge

Objective: The CCS will continue to provide programs that match the workforce needs of the State thereby ensuring that individuals earning degrees are able to successfully find employment and/or continue their education.

Objective: The Council on Instructional Affairs should initiate a discussion with the members of the Florida Collegiate Honors Council and develop any needed policy recommendations that would enhance honors programs. In addition, the two groups should develop a cooperative approach that assures that information on the honors programs in Florida's community colleges is effectively shared among the colleges.

Workforce Challenge

Objective: The system will develop closer partnerships with the business community, to support the college programs and to develop needed services for business.

Objective: The system will increase its role in enhancing skills and services of small businesses, particularly those owned by ethnic minorities and women.

Objective: The occupational forecasting process will be enhanced to identify future as well as current needs for programs.

Objective: The funding process will encourage the development of workforce–related distance learning courses to assist in meeting the needs of training for our citizens.

Objective: One-Stop Centers will be fully funded by federal and state dollars other than those appropriated to the CCS.

Objective: Child care and transportation funds will be provided to meet the needs of workforce and WAGES clients.

Partnership Challenge

Objective: The CCS will continue to develop partnerships, both as a system and among individual institutions, that reduce the financial burden required to provide students the most up-to-date education possible. The CCS will also maintain and enhance articulation agreements that will ensure students are able to transfer to both public and private colleges and universities as easily as possible.

APPENDIX G

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AA	Associate in Arts
AAS	Associate in Applied Science
ABE	Adult Basic Education
ACC	Articulation Coordinating Committee
ACT	American College Testing
A&P	Advanced and Professional
AP	Advanced Placement
AS	Associate in Science
ATD	Applied Technology Diploma
BBA	Balanced Budget Act
BOR	Board of Regents
BS	Bachelor of Science
CBA	Council of Business Affairs
CCLA	College Center for Library Automation
CCMIS	Community College Management Information System
CCPF	Community College Program Fund
CCS	Community College System
CIA	Council on Instructional Affairs
CLAST	College-Level Academic Skills Test
COE	Council on Occupational Education
COP	Council of Presidents
CPT	Computerized Placement Test
CROP	College Reach-Out Program
CSA	Council of Student Affairs
DATAE	Division of Applied Technology and Adult Education
DCC	Division of Community Colleges
DOE	Department of Education
DSO	Direct Support Organizations
EA/EO	Equal Access/Equal Opportunity
ESL	English as a Second Language
FACC	Florida Association of Community Colleges
FACTS	Florida Academic Counseling and Tracking for Students
FACU	Florida Association of Colleges and Universities
FAESP	Florida Association of Elementary School Principals
FASA	Florida Association of School Administrators
FASSP	Florida Association of Secondary School Principals
FCAAS	Florida Center for Advising and Academic Support
FCAT	Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test
FCCDLC	Florida Community College Distance Learning Consortium
FETPIP	Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program
FIRN	Florida Information Resources Network

FRAG	Florida Resident Access Grant
FSAG	Florida Student Assistance Grant
FSBA	Florida School Board Association
FTE	Full Time Equivalent
FTIC	First Time in College
GAP	Government Accountability to the People
GED	General Educational Development
GPA	Grade Point Average
IB	International Baccalaureate
ICUF	Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida
LINCC	Library Network for Community Colleges
LION	Library Information on Line
LUIS	Library User Information Service
MISATFOR	Management Information System Advisory Task Force
NCES	National Center for Education Statistics
OCP	Occupational Completion Points
PBB	Performance Based Budgeting
PBIF	Performance Based Incentive Funding
PBPB (PB^2)	Performance Based Program Budgeting
PBS	Public Broadcasting System
PECO	Public Education Capital Outlay
PEPC	Postsecondary Education Planning Commission
PSAV	Postsecondary Adult Vocational
PSV	Postsecondary Vocational
PSVC	Postsecondary Vocational Certificate
SACS	Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
SAT	Scholastic Achievement Test
SBCC	State Board of Community Colleges
SBE	State Board of Education
SCNS	Statewide Course Numbering System
SDB	Student Data Base
SPD	Staff and Program Development
SREB	Southern Regional Education Board
SUS	State University System
WAGES	Regional Work and Gain Economic Self-Sufficiency
WD	Workforce Development

INDEX

2+2 Structure 6
CCLA/LINCC 45
Child Care and Transportation 56
College Attendance 18
Community Service/Service-Learning in Community Colleges 43
Distance Learning 46
Economic Development Patterns 13
Enrollment Projections 15
Equity 26
Facilities 25
Fees 23
First Time In College Cap 7
Fiscal Patterns 20
Formal Articulation Policies 37
GED 16
Governance/Trustee Training 9
Honors Programs 50
Implications 20
Increased Emphasis on Merit Scholarships 42
Independent Colleges 39
One-Stop Centers 56
Personnel Patterns 20
Population Patterns 12
Postsecondary Education Planning Commission Access Responses 31
Program Enrollment Patterns 18
School District/Community College Collaboration 28
Staff and Program Development 21
State Aid for Part-time Students 41
State Need-Based Aid Programs 41

Statewide Student Advising System, Florida Academic Counseling and Tracking for Students (FACTS) 40
Student Financial Assistance 40
The External Environment 11
The Internal Environment 15
Wages and Workforce Development 14
Workforce Baccalaureate 33
Workforce Development 52

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").